

**DELHI UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY**

DELHI UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Cl. No. Y2. 25x M69187 F5

Ac. No. 5826 Date of release for loan

This book should be returned on or before the date last stamped below An overdue charge of 5 Paise will be collected for each day the book is kept overtime

SPEECHES AND WRITINGS

OF

The Rt. Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, P.C.

**FIRST
EDITION**

Price Rs. Three.

**G. A. NATESAN & Co., PUBLISHERS,
MADRAS**

CONTENTS

India's Goal	...	I
Lord Sinha's Congress Address	...	8
Self-Government for India	...	21
The Need for Political Reform	...	71
Nasik Conference Address	...	75
The C. I. D.	...	135
Delhi Congress Speech	...	141
The Rowlatt Bill	...	146
Repeal of Repressive Laws	...	165
The Use of Fire Arms	...	173
The Guildhall Speech	...	188
Speech at the League of Nations	...	192
Great Men of Bengal	...	205
Bombay Liberal Conference Address	...	207
Speech at the Simla Banquet	...	240
Speech at Perth	...	256
Address to New Zealand Parliament	...	269
Address to Students at Wellington	...	279
Reply to Civic Welcome at Suva	...	285
Speech at the Reform Club, Montreal	...	300
Mahatma Gandhi	...	305
Speech at the Canadian Club	...	315
Speech at the Royal Colonial Institute	...	318
Address to the Liberal Federation	...	328
Report on, the Dominions Tour	...	374


The League of Nations	...	401
Memorandum to the Delhi Conference	...	426
Gokhale and his Life-Work	...	436
Resolution in the Council of State on Kenya	...	451
The Administration of Kenya	...	464
Speech at the Queen's Hall Meeting	...	470
Speech at the Hotel Cecil	...	474
Kenya as a Crown Colony	...	487
Kenya Deputation's Statement	...	491
The Kenya Betrayal	...	501
Reply to General Smuts	...	510
Speech at Bangalore	...	517
Immigration into India Bill	...	532
Africa or India ?	...	541
Resolution on the Colonies Committee	...	569
India, a Dominion	...	586

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

THE Rt. Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri P. C., is a writer and speaker of rare distinction; and an attempt is made in this volume to present, under one cover, a comprehensive collection of his more important pronouncements on subjects of public interest. It includes, among others, his masterly essay on Self-Government, his speeches in the Congress, in the old Imperial Legislative Council and in the Council of State, his presidential address to the National Liberal Federation, his speech at the Second Assembly of the League of Nations, his orations in Australia, Fiji and Canada and his recent pronouncements in England and India, both on the Kenya question and on the question of Responsible Government for India. The collection also includes Mr. Sastri's appreciative studies of Gokhale and Gandhi. It is hoped that such a collection will be welcomed by the public in view of Mr. Sastri's eminent position in the public life of the country.

THE RT. HON. SRINIVASA SASTRI.

A SKETCH OF HIS LIFE AND CAREER.

 Welcome addition to the Series of Biographies of Eminent Indians published by Messrs. G. A. Natesan & Co., Madras, is the sketch of the life and career of the Rt. Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri. The sketch recounts Mr. Sastri's early life and education, his career as a school master, as a member of the Madras University and the Legislative Council. It traces his connection with the Servants of India Society and his services to the country as a Congressman, as a member of the Imperial Council, of the Council of State, of the Moderate Deputation to England, and later of the Imperial Conference and the League of Nations. Finally, the sketch deals with Mr. Sastri's Dominion tour and gives ample quotations from his speeches as also from the appreciations of press representatives and foreign statesmen. It has a handsome frontispiece and is priced annas four only.

Price 4 as. only.

G. A. Natesan & Co., George Town, Madras.

India's Goal

The following article, criticising Lord Crewe's interpretation of the Government of India's Despatch of 1911, was contributed to the Indian Review for August 1912 :—

THE now famous paragraph 3 of the Government of India's Despatch dated 25th August 1911 was conceived in the most lofty spirit of statesmanship that has actuated British policy in India at any period. Its transparent aim was not merely to redress the wrongs and assuage the woes of a sore-stricken people, but to strike out a bold policy that should reconcile them perpetually to the British Empire by making it in an ever-increasing degree compatible with their growing aspirations. To this much-interpreted paragraph the true key is no doubt to be found in the statements of the Under-Secretary of State for India. Mr. Montagu starts his official connection with India with a vivid perception of the ideas and tendencies of the present time. It is a rare joy to find emerging now and then from the Liberal ranks a young politician of his stamp, endowed with imagination to understand and courage to welcome openly the struggles for constitutional freedom of a people held in political dependence. He has apprehended what may be described as the mind of the

despatch, though it may not be the mind of every one of its signatories. The Marquess of Crewe, who first approved of the Despatch and, presumably, of the policy enunciated in its third paragraph, subsequently took alarm at the large departures that it involved from current ideas of Indian administration, and sought to explain away its meaning with a degree of earnestness, emphasis and iteration which precludes the theory that he was merely trying to conciliate the reactionaries. The complete and unconcealed satisfaction with which Lords Lansdowne and Curzon received his repudiations points to a feeling in Conservative circles that they have secured from the highest authority in Indian affairs a nullification of the hopes raised by the exuberant language of the Government of India. It is, therefore, necessary that the progressive party in India should place on record their determination to take their stand on the terms of the Despatch, which, in their opinion, carry greater authority than the pronouncement of an individual politician, though he may happen to be the Secretary of State for India for the time being.

The attack of the reactionaries, according to the noble Marquess, was delivered along two distinct but congruent lines. They apprehended the gradual weakening of the Government of India, and the corresponding development of autonomous local Self-Government, and likewise the stimulation of the hopes of Indian politicians towards Self-Government on Colonial lines. Lord Crewe explained that the present

policy of decentralization was not designed to bring about a federated system in India such as Bright used to advocate, but that it was only a logical development and slight amplification of Lord Curzon's own ideal. It was easy enough to demolish Bright's almost forgotten idea of a system of independent Local Governments with the Government of India left out. But was Lord Crewe quite in earnest or was he merely adopting a familiar Parliamentary device when he claimed the apostle of centralization as the father of the present policy of decentralization in India?

(In place of Colonial *Swaraj*, which is the goal of the Congress party in India, the Marquess of Crewe offers them three boons as constituents of a great programme of liberal reform. What are these? The maintenance of British supremacy in India, the continued devolution of powers from the Supreme to the Local Governments, and the giving of more appointments to qualified Indians.) Apparently, the Secretary of State is fully satisfied with their magnanimity. Their real character can be judged from the fact that the Marquess of Lansdowne, no friend of Indian aspirations, hailed them as indisputable axioms of Indian administration. Lord Crewe's liberalism is bankrupt of faith. It is devoid of trust in the principles that have actuated a great and illustrious party in English history for several generations. It has no regard for ancient civilizations. It casts to the winds the glowing belief in the possibilities of humanity

that has underlain all the great movements of history and forswears all schemes aiming at the progressive equality and brotherhood of the world's peoples.

Fancy a Liberal Secretary of State for India, who has been deservedly hailed as initiator in part of a great era of hope, proclaiming the impossibility of Self-Government for the Indian people on the ground of their race, and bidding them be content in perpetuity with careers of service in the Empire as contra-distinguished from careers of distinction! This surely is an unkind cut. What an answer to those who claim the benefits as well as the burdens of Empire! We have borne these cheerfully and shall bear them cheerfully in the hope that, in the fulness of time, we shall be enabled to rise to the full height of equality and freedom possible within the British constitution. The ideal of service contrasts no doubt favourably with the ideal of distinction, but it is only as applied to individuals and not to whole communities. All honour and glory to those great ones, who, with distinction placed within reach of their hands, elect deliberately to renounce it. But the Marquess of Crewe invites a whole nation to condemn themselves and their posterity as unworthy of distinction in their own country by reason of inherent defects. Surely 'virtue is its own reward' is a maxim that ill becomes a master who refuses to raise the wages of his servants. And it does not lie in the mouths of those who hold a practical monopoly of power and distinction in a country to pronounce against the

people of that country the doom of unredeemed, and unending servitude.

It is necessary, though for some reasons unpleasant, to recall the history of the goal of Indian political aspirations so emphatically repudiated by the Marquess of Crewe. For many years after the inception of the Indian National Congress its leaders were content to go along without committing the movement to a definite ideal. Of course individual politicians could not forbear occasionally to dip into the future, and as early as 1885 Colonial Self-Government had become a popular ideal, largely owing to the publication of Sir Henry Cotton's *New India*. But the cry was never raised from the Congress platform till Sir Henry Cotton himself gave expression to it in his presidential address at its Bombay Session of 1904. The first authoritative enunciation of the Congress goal was made in the constitution adopted in 1908 under stress of circumstances, which will be long in fading out of people's recollection. Suffice it to say that the country was at that time seriously agitated, not to say disturbed, by the prevalence of ideals inimical alike to British supremacy and to peace and order. All eyes were turned with anxiety to the action that the leaders of the Congress party might take, and there can be no doubt now that it was their clearly and firmly expressed determination to remain within the British Empire which contributed in a great measure to the restoration of tranquillity. At the present moment it is no exaggeration to say that

the ideal of Self-Government within the Empire is accepted by all schools of political thought in India. It is inconceivable that a lower ideal than that of Colonial *Swaraj* would have satisfied a self-respecting people. The Congress party paid indeed a great tribute to the liberal character of the British Constitution in embracing this ideal. Subject to difference in detail which the British-Indian statesmanship of the future will know how to adjust, they trust that there is scope within the constitution for India to grow by gradual steps from its present status of dependency to full fraternity with the other members of the Empire. Neither the expediency of the hour nor the large wisdom that looks beyond will justify the denial at this juncture of such possibilities to the people of India or such capacities of adaptation to the British constitution.

That Asiatic races never had, and therefore never can have, any real Self-Government is an old theory held by Conservatives like Salisbury, Mr. Balfour and Lord Curzon. It is sad, though not altogether surprising, that it should be advanced by a tried Liberal like the Marquess of Crewe as a reason for Indians being held in perpetual dependence. Race itself as a cause of difference between nations is nowadays being questioned by scientific observers. Weighty authorities incline to the view that environment and the struggle for existence are sufficient to account for the history and tendencies of peoples, and that race plays a subordinate, if any, part in moulding

their destinies. It is no doubt a convenient reason for maintaining the inequalities that have come to exist, and is on the same footing as the theory of individual desert which the haves have always urged against the have-nots. Even were it otherwise, are the racial qualities of Indians so entirely devoid of the elements necessary to make a self-governing people? The civilization of India has stood the inexorable test of time and has received in the course of its long history many elements of strength and variety. The Rajput has given it his stern chivalry, the Musulman his keen, almost jealous, sense of honour, the Mahratta his endurance and hardiness, the Parsi his wideawake enterprise and adaptiveness, and the Brahman his subtle and pervasive intellect. And every day now the Briton is pouring into this rich and complex life his energy, organised knowledge and vastly multiplied power and efficiency. No one who has not peeped into the Book of Fate can deny to such a people a destiny as great and glorious as any that has been vouchsafed to man. No, Lord Crewe cannot stay the march of India any more than King Canute could still the waves of the sea. A great ideal, provided it be not ignoble or disloyal, once planted in the hearts of a people, cannot be killed. Step by step, with many halts and goings-back but ever taking fresh starts, it must in the end realise itself.

Lord Sinha's Congress Address

Commenting on the Presidential Address of Lord (then Sir S.P.) Sinha to the Bombay Congress of 1915, Mr. Sastri wrote as follows to the Indian Review for January 1916 :—

SIR Satyendra Sinha's address was marked by the earnest and passionate patriotism which we have learned to associate with officials as well as non-officials in Bengal. When he referred to the throbbing pain in the soul of awakening India, or spoke of hope coming where despair held sway and faith where doubt spread its darkening shadow, one not only heard the poetical language of the Bengali, but saw in his eye the fire of the patriot. He touched the hearts of his audience when he affirmed that the government of the people, for the people, and *by the people* was the only form of self-government which would satisfy the aspirations of India. In fact, so complete was the accord between him and the thousands who eagerly listened that every one must have felt that his own thoughts were finding clear and warm expression in such a passage as this :—

Does any reasonable man imagine that it is possible to satisfy the palpitating hearts of the thousands of young men who, to use the classic words of Lord Morley, leave our universities intoxicated with the ideas of freedom, nationality and Self-Government with the comfortless assurance that free institutions are the special privilege of the West? Can any one

wonder that many of these young men, who have not the same robust faith in the integrity and benevolence of England as the members of this Congress, should lose heart at the mere suspicion of such a policy and, driven to despair, conclude that the roar and scream of confusion and carnage is better than peace and order without even the distant prospect of freedom?

When again Sir Satyendra, in manly and deliberate tones, concluded with the sentence:

I say with all the earnestness and emphasis that I can command that, if the noble policy of Malcolm and Elphinstone, Canning and Ripon, Bright and Morley, is not steadily, consistently and unflinchingly adhered to, the Moderate party amongst us will soon be depleted of all that is fine and noble in human character.

The thunder of applause that greeted the last words seemed the symphony of ten thousand eager voices echoing the solemn warning so that it may be heard by all who are concerned.

The part of the address which commanded universal approbation was the one in which the rights of Indians to bear arms and to positions of command in the army were advocated. The Indian case in this respect was put forth with telling conciseness and unanswerable cogency. It was the keen dexterity of a lawyer which found a handy argument in the risks and perils that Indian officers of the Criminal Intelligence Department have to face. Sir Satyendra justly rebuked the maligners of our nation who assert that in the absence of the English neither a rupee nor a virgin would be left in some parts of the country as being, albeit unconsciously, maligners of the British nation as well. He said he could conceive of no more scathing indictment of British Rule. A superman might gloat over the spectacle of the conquest of might over justice and righteousness, but I am much mistaken if the

British nation, fighting now as ever for the cause of justice and freedom and liberty, will consider it as other than discreditable to itself that after nearly two centuries of British Rule, India has been brought to-day to the same emasculated condition as the Britons were in the beginning of the 5th century when the Roman legions left the English shores in order to defend their own country against the Huns, Goths and other barbarian hordes.

It was but natural, and the President of the Indian National Congress should have expected, that his pronouncement on Self-Government for India would be received with different feelings by different sections of his countrymen. The cautious politicians welcomed it as an attempt to reconcile what is best in the great aspirations of the hour with what is most generous and responsive in the counsels of British statesmanship made by one whose inherent authority to speak on the subject has been enhanced by his having seen the affairs of the Empire, though only for a brief period, from the inside. The more eager spirits, on the other hand, regarded it with mixed feelings. They could not but be thankful that he established on an unassailable basis the claim of the people of India to full autonomy within the Empire both as a birthright and as derived from repeated pledges and declarations of Imperial policy. They cheered him to the echo when he interpreted His Imperial Majesty's message of sympathy and of hope as a message of sympathy for political aspirations and hope for their ultimate fulfilment. They were thrilled by his declaration that he believed with the fervour of religious conviction that that wise and righteous policy was still the policy of the great

English nation. Such robust and undying faith has inspired the labours of our greatest patriots and is an indispensable quality in those who lead a constitutional struggle. Unfortunately, however, in a great majority of cases it does not survive the first inevitable failures, and it is difficult to say which are the stronger feelings in the country at the present moment—the hopes of a liberal measure of self-rule that have been roused, or the fears that our political status will not improve after the war through the voluntary action of the Imperial Government. If this expression of belief in the righteousness of Britain's policy towards India appeared somewhat romantic to the more eager spirits, his plea for patience and slow and cautious growth came as a bitter disappointment. The parable of the man whose broken bones have been put in a steel frame was a particularly unsavoury pill to them. If we must talk in parables, they ask, is it not possible to conceive of a case in which the surgeon, for purposes of his own, unduly prolongs the period of enforced rest for his patient?

In what ways exactly Indians are to-day not fit to govern themselves, how the peoples of the various colonies demonstrated their fitness when responsible government was granted them, and what proofs we shall have to adduce in our own time, Sir Satyendra did not say. He took our unfitness for granted. This opinion of his was concurred in, he said, by prominent leaders of the Congress. It is noteworthy that

he did not quote, as others did, the language of the first article of the Constitution :

These objects are to be achieved by constitutional means by bringing about a *steady* reform of the existing system of administration * * *.

The argument apparently is that Congressmen are precluded, so long as they do not repeal the word *steady* by a unanimous vote of all the provinces, from demanding a large measure of constitutional reform, though it might commend itself to them as desirable. It is possible that the greatest lawyer of Calcutta dismissed the argument as legal pedantry.

We now come to the famous passage in which Sir Satyendra enumerated three possible ways of attaining Self-Government, dismissed two of these as out of the question for India, and recommended the third as the only safe and practicable way. Now the argument by elimination of possible alternatives, by reason of its conclusiveness in the exact sciences, is often extended, by those that seek effect, to regions of speculation where all the data are generally not known and even those that are known are incapable of precise definition. But the result of such extended application is not always happy. In this particular case one is constrained to say, with all due respect to Sir Satyendra, that he falls into a grievous error. The reasoning requires that the three ways open to us should lead to the same destination : in other words " the priceless treasure of self-government " must in the three alternative cases be one and the same, and the context clearly proves that autonomy

within the empire is the intended goal. Now the first way is that of a free gift from the British nation. ' In rejecting this alternative, Sir Satyendra speaks of it as a vision that "could only be realised if India free from the English could have stood in a tranquil state or in a sphere of absolute isolation". This is independence outside the British Empire: who asked for this boon from the British nation? Did ever any political party in India petition the Imperial Parliament for a decree that the British people should immediately withdraw from India and leave her to herself? What has been put forward as India's aspiration is autonomy *within* the Empire. This surely it is possible for Great Britain to grant as a free gift. She has done so to several colonies, though none of them can stand even to-day, if cut off from the Empire, in a tranquil state or in a sphere of absolute isolation. The second way is that of a conflict with the British power—open war or intimidation by assassination. Open war, if successful, will result in absolute independence. As to those miscreants who throw bombs, it is difficult to say what their political aim may be, if they have a clear political aim—whether to drive the English out of India or only to wrest political concessions from them. The third way, that of increasing fitness on the one side and ready concession on the other, is the only one that is admissible in view of the object to be attained. Here we stand on firm ground. Great changes have taken place, as has been stated in dealing with the first way,

in the status of British colonies as the result of peaceful political agitation. Our hopes are grounded on such precedents. Sir Satyendra cites French Canada and the Boer Republics as examples of British generosity even in dealing with rebels and enemies. Such examples are dangerous. The perverse student may infer that Britain is generous only when she cannot help it. Let us examine this third way a little more closely. It is to be a prolonged process of growth, during which the people of India are to ask in proportion to their fitness and the British Imperial authorities are to give, when and to the extent what it will be impossible for them to withhold. This is what is known as political agitation or constitutional struggle. The process may conceivably be peaceful throughout. Given unfailing forbearance and good faith on both sides, it is quite a possibility. The one constant business of patriots should be to bring about and maintain this condition of peaceful and happy progress. Sometimes a concession may be too easily granted—the first way. Often, however, the tension between the sides will become severe. A sense of delayed rights will lead to impatience and strong speaking and writing. The reply on the other side will be repression. And this disturbed state of the polity may go on from bad to worse till finally a settlement is reached by the grant of concessions. In such a case one set of chroniclers will describe the event as a boon granted freely and without reference to fitness, while another will boast of having wrested

a just right by sacrifice and suffering. In other words, what is called the third way will be found generally to be a combination, more or less difficult to analyse, of the first and second ways. Both Ranade and Gokhale used to say that privileges too easily conferred are not valued or used properly, and that only those are real blessings which are won by adequate sacrifices and sufferings. This is true doctrine without doubt. But every step of popular progress makes the next step easier, and unless history is a profitless study and experience makes no addition to human wisdom, there is reason to hope that political advancement will involve a continually diminishing amount of sacrifice and suffering. Of living Empires, the British Empire is the one within which it has been proved possible for a government to raise through regular stages from autocracy to the ideal of government of the people, for the people and by the people. As it is the good fortune of India to have come within the British Empire, so let it be the glory of that Empire to raise India to the fullest height of her constitution by entirely peaceful methods.

The idea of fitness for self-rule requires some clearing up. Those who affirm India's fitness are asked: Are we ready *to-morrow* to start a Parliamentary form of government in the provinces and in the seat of federal authority? Can we have the whole machinery in full working order at a moment's notice—party cabinets, resignations of the ministry,

appeals to the country and all that? Nobody makes such an absurd claim. When we say that a certain person is fit for the office of Deputy Collector, we do not mean that the moment he is installed he will make an efficient Deputy Collector, but that, if he be given a fair trial in the office, he will in time discharge its duties efficiently and satisfactorily. So in the case of the Indian people. Our contention is that among them there is sufficient material on which to build a structure of self-government. Their intellectual and moral equipment fully justifies their being trusted with responsible government. But existing political institutions cannot be overhauled altogether. Adjustments have to be made with the utmost care. This is a work of several years, perhaps of one whole generation. The probation, therefore will last longer than till *to-morrow*. Let us remember also that political education does not proceed at a uniform pace. During certain periods it takes enormous strides. The last ten years have witnessed in India more progress than has taken place in any fifty years since the English came to India. The next ten years are sure to be marked by vastly greater progress. Nevertheless, the exercise of autonomy will in the first decades lead to serious mistakes and result in heavy losses. Perhaps a few animosities, now held down by superincumbent pressure, will break out in violent forms. But these risks and others of the kind will have to be faced at any time the people of India get real power—whether now or at the end of two hundred years. Shall we

face them as we may or leave the hard task to succeeding generations?

One idea of great usefulness which the President of the Congress put forward was that at the end of the war the Imperial authorities should issue a declaration definitely accepting the political goal of the National Congress and the Muslim League. The present writer may be pardoned for quoting a sentence from an article that he contributed to the first issue of "Young India" published on November 17 of last year.

At the end of the war Indian politicians, unless they mean to betray the interests of their country, must press for an undertaking by the supreme authorities, not to be set aside or whittled down in practice like some of the pledges and proclamations known to the history of this country, that they will adopt suitable measures devised for the express purpose of placing India constitutionally alongside the Colonies.

The language in some respects anticipates Sir Satyendra's words. After quoting Lord Hardinge's advice to the Civil Service which contained a promise of India's future "as a true friend of the Empire and not merely as a trusty dependent," he proceeded :

Lest there be any among us of so little faith as to doubt the real meaning of those memorable words, or any Englishmen inclined to whittle down the meaning of this promise, I hope there will be an authentic and definite proclamation with regard to which there will be no evasion or misunderstanding possible.

The appeal carries peculiar weight as it comes from one who in his own words "has been in the inner councils of the Empire for however short a time." No doubt it will "touch the heart and appeal to the imagination of the people," and therefore we fully trust the President will press the suggestion on

the attention of the authorities. To prevent this proclamation, if it should be made, from being disregarded like some former proclamations by the authorities, it is essential that its fulfilment should be safeguarded by the insertion of a time-limit, say of 20 or 30 years. But it is precisely on this question of time that Sir Satyendra would not commit himself, to the great disappointment of his more enthusiastic fellow-Congressmen. He used an abundance of such expressions as 'the steep and weary path,' 'gradual,' 'cautious' and 'patient preparation.' On the other hand, he saw that the authorities would take advantage of the omission of a time-limit and postpone reform indefinitely. But he left the matter there, unable to make up his mind in the only way proper to the case. Mark the balance and indecision in the following passage :

While we admit that the goal is not yet, we refuse to believe that it is so distant as to render it a mere vision of the imagination. We deprecate the impatience of those who imagine that we have only to stretch our hands to grasp the coveted prize. But we differ equally from those who think that the end is so remote as to be a negligible factor in the ordinary work of even present-day administration.

Shallow optimism may be dangerous in political affairs : but is not the pessimism equally dangerous which, after so many years of English education and apprenticeship in representative institutions under the peerless guidance of the British *Raj*, hesitates to demand that responsible government should be worked up to in the course of the next thirty years ?

How excessively and needlessly cautious Sir Satyendra is in his estimate of the political capacity of his countrymen comes out clearly in his treatment of the subject of local self-government. In this sphere a bold and fresh departure would be appropriate, no dire disaster or red ruin need be apprehended. But we see no strong demand, no bold enunciation of policy. It is still only "*more and more* of elections both of members and chairmen, and *less and less* of official control from within." It is quite time to ask that it should be, at least in advanced localities, *all* elections and *no* official control from within. Sir Satyendra recognises that local bodies are a most effective training ground to fit the people for the use of higher political powers. He deplores that after thirty years local bodies are still far from the stage outlined in Lord Ripon's famous resolution of 1882. After saying that the goal of self-government is not yet, he might have affirmed that the day of real local self-government had come. The lesson of autonomy must be learned somewhere: where shall it be if not in the more advanced local bodies?

Self-Government for India

The following are extracts from Mr Sastri's pamphlet on "Self-Government for India Under the British Flag" published by the Servants of India Society in Dec. 1916.

THE demand of Indians to be allowed to govern themselves is countered by the assertion that they are unfit for so high a task. It is alleged that when the English colonies were granted responsible government they had reached a higher standard of fitness than we have now attained. This is not historically true. The present prosperity and enterprise of the Dominions should be entirely forgotten when we try to picture the colonies as they were in the forties and fifties of the last century. Fifty years of political and economic independence, as the example of Japan shows us, can make wonderful changes in the condition of a people. Let it also be remembered that fifty years of the modern time are really much longer than the like period in any former century. Canada was the first of British Colonies to be made self-governing, and it is in Canada that British political institutions are believed to have shown their happiest results. Luckily, we possess in the Report of Lord Durham a graphic and in general

a faithful description of the condition of the Colony and its people at the time when the concession of responsible government was made. Canada was divided into two provinces, Lower and Upper Canada. In Lower Canada the population was 600,000, being divided into French 450,000 and English 150,000. Upper Canada had 400,000, mostly English. In both Provinces there were representative institutions wholly elected with power of voting supplies and imposing taxes. But the Executive were appointed wholly by the Crown, and as they had control of certain revenues and other sources, were enabled to defy the legislature. The public offices were filled by men belonging to certain families, giving rise in Upper Canada to what was known under the odious name of the 'Family Compact.' There were bitter disputes arising out of the unjust way in which the Crown lands were distributed as well as what were known as the 'Clergy Reserves.' In Lower Canada the minority of the English practically monopolised political power and the public service, and the bulk of the trade was in their hands. The wrangles between the Legislature and the Government were protracted and often led to violent recriminations." In Lower Canada the political differences were also racial differences, the French through their paper, *La Canadienne*, stirring up a distinctively national spirit. In both Provinces alike the political discontent led to strong physical demonstrations, threats of annexation to the United

States, the stoppage of supplies to Government, and strong representations to the authorities in Britain for the grant of responsible government. Matters came to a head when Papineau in the Lower Province and Mackenzie in the Upper raised the standard of revolt, but not in concert. The risings were speedily put down, the constitutions were suspended, and Lord Durham came out as Governor-General with almost plenary powers in 1838.

The Report that he drew up, describing the condition of the country and making recommendations for its improvement, is considered to be one of the ablest State documents ever submitted to Parliament. Constitution-makers go to it for inspiration. Its perusal is a tonic to those whose faith in the healing and ennobling power of popular institutions is weak. The chief lesson it conveys to us in India is that responsible government is a remedy and the only sure remedy for the evils arising from imperfect understanding between the Government and the people. Existing defects in India are pointed to by opponents of progress as barring the way to a fuller measure of popular government. Whereas, if a second Lord Durham could now come out to report on Indian affairs, he would in all likelihood advocate the immediate grant of responsible government *as a cure* for the ills of the body politic.

Let us, as far as possible in his own words, give an idea of what Canada was like when he

proposed his bold and startling reform. First as to education :

The continued negligence of the British Government left the mass of the people without any of the institutions, which would have elevated them in freedom and civilization. It has left them without the education and without the institutions of local self-government that would have assimilated their character and habits, in the easiest and best way, to those of the Empire." "It is impossible to exaggerate the want of education among the habitants. No means of instruction have ever been provided for them, and they are almost and universally destitute of the qualifications even of reading and writing." "A great proportion of the teachers could neither read nor write. . . . These ignorant teachers could convey no useful instruction to their pupils. These appointments were jobbed by the members among their political partisans ; nor were the funds very honestly managed.

Public administration was in a sad way :

But if such is the bad organisation and imperfection of the system at the seat of Government, it may be easily believed that the remainder of the Province enjoyed no very vigorous or complete administration. In fact, beyond the walls of Quebec all regular administration of the country appeared to cease ; and there literally was hardly a single public officer of the civil Government except in Montreal and Three Rivers, to whom any order could be directed.

One other extract should suffice under this head. It refers to the district of Gaspé.

About the administration of justice therein I could hardly obtain any information ; indeed on one occasion it being necessary, for some particular purpose, to ascertain the fact, inquiry was made at all the public offices in Quebec, whether or not there was any coroner for Gaspé. It was a long time before any information could be got on this point and it was at last in some measure cleared up by the Accountant-General discovering an estimate for the salary of such an officer. The only positive information, therefore, that I can give respecting the present administration of justice in Gaspé is, that I received a petition from the inhabitants praying that the Act by which it is regulated might not be renewed.

The system of justice was most unsatisfactory and juries had ceased to command confidence. Trade was backward, banking and other facilities were ill-

organised and internal communications were lacking in the remoter parts. As to municipal institutions, which are justly believed to be a good school of political education for the people, they were almost non-existent.

Lower Canada remains without municipal institutions of local-self-government, which are the foundations of Anglo-Saxon freedom and civilization." "The inhabitants of Lower Canada were unhappily initiated into self-government at exactly the wrong end and those who were not trusted with the management of a parish were enabled by their votes to influence the destinies of a State" "In the rural districts habits of self-government were almost unknown, and education is so scantily diffused as to render it difficult to procure a sufficient number of persons competent to administer the functions that would be created by a general scheme of popular local control.

In fact, judged by every criterion applied in India, the French population of Quebec should have been pronounced to be utterly unfit even for representative institutions, let alone responsible government. Yet they are now amongst the most progressive and public-spirited people in the British Empire and have produced statesmen like Sir Wilfrid Laurier. Here are two extracts, from which it will appear how unpromising the material seemed at the time of Lord Durham.

But the French population of Lower Canada possesses neither such institutions (municipal) nor such a character (popular initiative). Accustomed to rely entirely on the Government, it has no power of doing anything for itself, much less of aiding the central authority." "The institutions of France during the period of the colonization of Canada were, perhaps more than those of any other European nation, calculated to repress the intelligence and freedom of the great mass of the people. These institutions followed the Canadian Colonists across the Atlantic. The same central, ill-organised, unimproving and repressive despotism extended over him. Not merely was he allowed no voice in the government of his

province or that of his rulers, but he was not even permitted to associate with his neighbours for the regulation of those municipal affairs which the central authority neglected under the pretence of managing.' "The priest continued to exercise over him his ancient influence. No general provision was made for education, and as its necessity was not appreciated, the Colonist made no attempt to repair the negligence of his Government." "They made little advance beyond the first progress in comfort, which the bounty of the soil absolutely forced upon them; under the same institutions they remained the same uninstructed, inactive, unprogressive people.

More than all this was the natural enmity of the French and the English people, to which there is hardly a parallel in India. Sir James Craigh wrote :

The line of distinction between us is completely drawn; friendship, cordiality are not to be found, even common intercourse scarcely exists.

From Lord Durham :

I found two nations warring in the bosom of a single State. I found a struggle not of principles but of races. It is scarcely possible to conceive descendants of any of the great European nations more unlike each other in character and temperament, more totally separated from each other by language, laws, and modes of life or placed in circumstances more calculated to produce natural misunderstanding, jealousy or hatred.

To show how intense political animosity was even after many years of responsible government, the following incident will suffice. In 1849 a Bill was passed giving compensation to people who had suffered losses for no fault of theirs during the preceding rebellion. Lord Elgin, then Governor-General, gave his assent to it. The Tory opposition, consisting mostly of English, raised the cry, 'no pay to rebels' and "some of them in their anger even issued a manifesto in favour of annexation. The Parliament House at Montreal was burnt down, a great number

of books and records destroyed, and Lord Elgin grossly insulted for having assented to the Bill."

What Canada obtained after strenuous struggles, the States of Australia got with comparative ease. In fact the colonial policy of Great Britain had been liberalised and responsible government was considered a proper solution of the problem of colonial administration. Most statesmen of the time believed, and were glad to believe that, once liberated from the shackles of the Colonial Office, the Colonies would in course of time declare themselves independent of England. In this, however, events have proved them utterly mistaken. The grant of responsible government, wherever it has been made, has only strengthened the bond between the suzerain power and the subordinate but autonomous governments—a lesson which may well be borne in mind by those prophets of evil who prognosticate that in India political generosity will be met with ingratitude.

The Australian States attained responsible government between the years 1853 and 1859, Western Australia alone rising to the status in 1890. In 1850 the entire population in Australia was about 266,000; in 1860 it was 349,000. It is well-known that it started as a penal settlement. "For some years," says a historian, "the history of the infant settlement was that of a large gaol." It was in 1840 that the Secretary of State for the Colonies declared that no more convicts should be transported to Australia. The discovery of the first gold mine in

1851 ensured the economic prosperity of the colony. The population began to increase rapidly. It could not naturally have been marked by a high degree of culture or refinement, for it must have consisted to a large extent of adventurers, speculators and labourers. As was to be expected, politics in such a colony must be far different from politics elsewhere. The English party system and cabinet Government took long to strike root. Between 1854 and 1890, the year when the Commonwealth was established, no Government could be sure of power for any length of time.

In South Australia there were forty changes of Ministry in thirty-seven years. In New Zealand the first four Ministries were strangled in their cradles, and as late as August 1884 there came three weeks of upheaval in Wellington in which three Ministries resigned in succession. Before the coming of Sir George Turner in 1894 no Victorian Premier ever held the reins for five years on end and only two Cabinets had endured for as long as three. In New South Wales Executives were even shorter-lived. Before Reid was sworn in 1894 only one Prime Minister, Parkes, had managed to retain office in Sydney for four years without break, Sir Henry once just contrived to do that; no one else stayed in for more than two years and nine months."

The instability of Cabinets was only the reflection of the instability of political parties. It took long for these to be formed and organised and in the interval there were humours of political life of which it is very interesting to read. Mr. Reeves writes as follows :

At public meetings candidates were pledged on certain prominent questions, and were usually accounted as owing allegiance to this or that leader. But the opportunities of disloyalty were innumerable, and full advantage was taken of them. Men would keep platform pledges to the letter and break them in spirit,—could even, thanks to ignorance or apathy amongst their constituents, ignore them altogether. There was very little direct corruption; but unscrupulous men would support Ministries for what grants they hoped to get for

their districts. Men still more unscrupulous joined or deserted parties simply in the hope of office. There were members avowedly independent, who were occasionally the most honourable men in public life, but more often the reverse. On the whole, the experience of Parliamentary parties without tight bonds and lasting lines of cleavage was depressing to most of those behind the scenes. It was emphatically a life in which it was wise to remember that your enemy might some day be your friend, while your friend would probably become your enemy.

In South Africa too the success of responsible government has been remarkable. There were many who predicted disaster when the Government of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman had the courage to carry out their promise of autonomy to the newly-conquered Boer States. Their pastoral occupations, crude ideas, ignorance and general lack of refinement, taken along with their recent enmity to the British, were no doubt strong grounds for misdoubting the results of the great constitutional experiment. Still if we omit the outbreak of Hertzogism and of the serious education trouble it caused, the South African States, especially after the Union, have had a career of progress and prosperity. Their loyalty during the present War, notwithstanding the rebellion of De Wet, is a great tribute to the popularity of the free political institutions that Great Britain has allowed them to enjoy.

ENGLAND

Those that would deny to India the boon of self-government fix their gaze exclusively on the darker features in the condition of her people. If a similar one-sided examination were to be made of any country, it would be easy to draw a harrowing pic-

ture. Take England herself, where popular liberty has found such a congenial home for a long time now. Before 1832 her political condition was notoriously backward. Parliament scarcely represented the people. Jobbing and corruption were rife. The masses were uneducated (the Education Act was only passed in 1870) and could not cast votes with any intelligent understanding of what they were doing. If, as Mr. Curtis says in *The Problem of the Commonwealth*, "national self-government depends not upon the handful of public men needed to supply cabinets and parliaments, but on the electorate, on the fitness of a sufficient proportion of the people themselves to choose rulers able to rule," England's fitness for self-government is of very recent date indeed. A Parliamentary Commission which reported in 1835 gives a most unflattering description of the condition of municipalities and boroughs at the time. Three extracts are sufficient as a sample. They are long, but considering how the shortcomings of local bodies in India are made the occasion for assailing the national character and pronouncing an adverse judgment on the aptitude of Indians for autonomy, it is necessary to give conclusive evidence that all mankind, including the portion which inhabits the home of freedom, is tarred with the same brush. Our authority is the standard work on *Local Government in England* by Redlich and Hirst.

The corporations look upon themselves and are considered by the inhabitants as separate and exclusive bodies; they have powers and privileges within the towns and cities from

which they are named, but in most places all identity of interest between the corporation and the inhabitants has disappeared. Some corporations are occasionally spoken of as exercising their privileges through a popular body, but in the widest sense in which the term popular body is used in regard to corporate towns, it designates only the whole body of freemen; and in most towns the freemen are a small number, compared with the respectable inhabitants interested in their municipal government and possessing every qualification, except a legal one, to take a part in it. In Plymouth, where the population, including Devonport, is more than 75,000, the number of freemen is only 437, and 145 of these are non-resident. In Norwich, the great majority of the inhabitant householders and rate-payers are excluded from the corporate body; while paupers, lodgers, and others, paying neither rates nor taxes, are admitted to the exercise of the functions of freemen, and form a considerable portion of the corporation. In Ipswich containing more than 20,000 inhabitants, the resident freemen form about one fifty-fifth part of the population. Of these more than one-third are not rated, and of those who are rated many are excused the payment of their rates. About one-ninth of the whole are paupers. More than eleven-twelfths of the property assessed in this borough belongs to those who are excluded from the corporation. All the inhabitants whose rent exceeds £4 per annum are taxed under a Local Act for municipal purposes. Of these who are so taxed, less than one-fifteenth are freemen. The assessed taxes paid in the borough exceed £5,000 *per annum*. The amount paid by all the corporate bodies is less than one-twentieth of the whole.

Few corporations admitted any positive obligation to expend surplus revenues upon public objects. Such expenditure was regarded 'as a spontaneous act of private generosity, rather than a well-considered application of the public revenue,' and the credit which the close body would claim in such a case was 'not that of judicious administrators but of public benefactors.' The financial picture may be completed by one more citation from the Report: In general the corporate funds are but partially applied to Municipal purposes, such as the preservation of the peace by an efficient police, or in watching or lighting the town, etc.; but they are frequently expended in feasting, and in paying the salaries of unimportant officers. In some cases, in which the funds are expended on public purposes, such as building public works, or other objects of local improvement, an expense has been incurred much beyond what would be necessary if due care had been taken. This has happened at Exeter, in consequence of the plan of avoiding public contract, and of proceeding without adequate estimates. These abuses often originate in the negligence of the corporate bodies, but more frequently in the opportunity afforded to them of obliging

members of their own body, or the friends and relations of such members.

In conclusion, we report to Your Majesty that there prevails amongst the inhabitants of a great majority of the incorporated towns a general and, in our opinion, a just dissatisfaction with their municipal institutions, a distrust of the self-elected municipal councils, whose powers are subject to no popular control, and whose acts and proceedings, being secret, are unchecked by the influence of public opinion; a distrust of the Municipal magistracy, tainting with suspicion the local administration of justice, and often accompanied with contempt of the persons by whom the law is administered; a discontent under the burthens of local taxation, while revenues that ought to be applied for the public advantage are diverted from their legitimate use and are sometimes wastefully bestowed for the benefit of individuals, sometimes squandered for purposes injurious to the character and morals of the people. We therefore feel it to be our duty to represent to Your Majesty that the existing municipal corporations of England and Wales neither possess nor deserve the confidence or respect of Your Majesty's subjects, and that a thorough reform must be effected before they can become, what we humbly submit to Your Majesty they ought to be, useful and efficient instruments of local government.

The following is the authors' comment :

When one comes to examine the facts set out in this Report, one cannot but wonder how such abuses could have been tolerated for generations and centuries in a land whose constitution was regarded by some of its greatest statesmen and thinkers as an embodiment of political justice and political wisdom. For the picture presented by the Report is that of a complete breakdown of administrative efficiency, joined with a decay of the elementary rules of local self-government. These symptoms, as the Commissioners clearly show, were not natural, but were the artificial product of a system of political corruption erected and kept up by the ruling oligarchy. This oligarchy had copied and improved upon the example set by the Crown in the days of the Tudors and Stuarts and had deliberately degraded the organization of local government for political purposes.

A critic who saw only the evil side of things might likewise be surprised at the fact that the great measures for the emancipation of women and the removal of the disabilities of the Catholics are not many decades old. He would express stern disapprobation

of the political caucuses and party organizations which twist and misrepresent the important issues which the voter has to settle at a general election, but which he cannot understand in their real bearings, so much is he mystified and confounded by the interested representations that are made to him. Our pessimistic friend would be scandalised by the sale of titles and honours which seems to go on, whichever of the great parties is in power. The luxuries of the rich and the corruption of high life would form a formidable count in his indictment. The disclosures of the divorce count and the enormous extent to which betting is allowed under one form or another are aspects of social life which would shock and sadden him. When he came to consider the industrial organization he would be horrified by the immoralities of crowded factory-life and the frequent strikes and combinations that threaten the very foundation of the country's prosperity. When, depressed by all this and sick at heart, he came to a contemplation of the drink evil and the brutalisation attendant on it and the horrible condition of the slums with their dirt and poverty and ungodliness, he might well throw up his hands in despair and exclaim that the people of England should not be left to their own devices. So does an unrelieved enumeration of the weaknesses of private and public life in India produce the impression that her people have no redeeming virtues which by cultivation and constant exercise will enable them to sustain the burden of self-government.

FITNESS

In spite of the vicissitudes of fortune through which our country has passed, the great Dravidian, Aryan and Mahomedan civilizations are found in vigour, if not in their pristine purity. Each one of these civilizations has developed forms of government and systems of administration which have been productive of beneficent results to the people. Judged by modern standards they might be pronounced to lack the elements of strength and thoroughness. Nor do they appear to have given rise to democratic or popular forms of organization of the kind that we are familiar with to-day. Self-government then, in the sense of the power to develop an indigenous polity and find an indigenous agency to maintain it, has always been with us. It may have been overborne at times and not had free play, it may have degenerated under stress of adversity, it may have left the people weak, disorganised and helpless before external force; but it has always been there. The numerous Indian States carry on before our eyes the ancient traditions, transformed, it is true, in great measure and adapted to the special needs of the British pattern, but still kept alive by age-long aptitudes. In our own time the work done in these territories by some Diwans and administrators within the limitations to which they are subject can bear comparison with the great deeds of Western statesmen in British India.

IN HIGH EXECUTIVE OFFICE

Whenever opportunity has been afforded, Indians have shown that they can work modern institutions in the modern spirit. In the executive, no less than in the Judicial Department, officers of the Provincial Civil Service recruited by competition have proved themselves, man for man, the peers of their brethren in the Indian Civil Service. The Indians who were first appointed to the Council of the Secretary of State for India have elicited warm appreciation from no less a judge of men than Lord Morley. Lord Minto and Lord Hardinge have in turn borne generous testimony to the assistance they derived from the advice and co-operation of their Indian Ministers. The late Mr. Krishnaswamy Aiyar of Madras, the first Indian on that side of the country to whom a statue was erected by public subscription in which Europeans and Indians joined, has been the recipient of posthumous tributes from his European colleagues, which are remarkable as much for the admiration which they convey as for the note of personal attachment which they strike. To Mr. Gokhale, who struck the imagination of the English people, in many ways, was reserved the unique honour of discussing affairs of high international moment, albeit in an informal way, with the Government of South Africa. This difficult and delicate task he performed with such ability, fairness and statesmanlike grasp of the issues involved that he earned the gratitude and admiration of all parties concerned.

Speaking on the proposal to appoint Indians to Executive Councils, Lord Morley said (1908) :

We are not altogether without experience because a year ago, or somewhat more, it was my good fortune to be able to appoint two Indian gentlemen to the Council of India sitting at the India office. Many apprehensions reached me as to what might happen. So far, at all events, those apprehensions have been utterly dissipated. The concord between the two Indian members of the Council and their colleagues has been unbroken, their work has been excellent, and you will readily believe me when I say that the advantage to me of being able to ask one of these two gentlemen to come and tell me something about an Indian question from an Indian point of view, is enormous. I find in it a chance of getting the Indian angle of vision, and I feel sometimes as if I were actually in the streets of Calcutta.

Arguing for the appointment of Indians to Executive Councils, Lord Morley said (1909):

You make an Indian a Judge of the High Court, and Indians have even been acting Chief Justices. As to capacity, who can deny that they have distinguished themselves as administrators of Native States, where far more demand is made on their resources, intellectual and moral?

Mr. Charles Roberts, at a banquet given in honour of Sir K. G. Gupta in 1905, said:

When Sir Krishna first took his seat at the Council table, Lord Morley's innovation of appointing Indian gentlemen as members of the Council was still an experiment. It was not an experiment to-day. It was now an undoubted success, accepted as a matter of course. That Indians should be on the Council was not merely desirable; it was, he believed, indispensable for the right Government of India.

Speaking at the United Service Club at Simla in 1910, Lord Minto said:

Mr. Sinha is the first Indian colleague of the Viceroy. It is quite unnecessary for me to remind you of the great position his distinguished and exceptional abilities had obtained for him at the Calcutta bar, and, gentlemen, I cannot let this opportunity pass without bearing testimony to the able assistance he has rendered to the Government of India and thanking him for the absolute fairness and broad-minded patriotism, which has always characterised the advice I have so often sought from him.

The *Pioneer* wrote thus of Sir S. P. Sinha when he resigned his seat on the Viceroy's Council :

That Mr. Sinha has performed his duties as part of the Government of India conscientiously, faithfully and with no small measure of success, that his advice, loyally and straightforwardly given, has been of the utmost value to his colleagues, will readily be acknowledged by the whole official world of Simla, who will be the first to regret his severance from the inner Councils of the Government, while recognising the personal sacrifices Mr. Sinha has made in consenting to become the instrument where-by an important constitutional precedent has been established.

Sir Valentine Chirol wrote in the *Times* :

Mr. Sinha's resignation is much to be regretted in the public interest; for his discharge of the duties attaching to his post has gone far to reconcile those who, like myself, had misgivings as to the wisdom of calling any Indian into the Viceroy's Executive Council, and chiefly on the very grounds which have been erroneously suggested as an explanation of Mr. Sinha's resignation.

Lord Hardinge paid the following tributes of praise to Sir Syed Ali Imam :

As for Sir Ali Imam, I can only speak of him as a colleague imbued with the highest sense of duty, patriotism and loyalty. Not only by his actual service as head of the legislative department, but also by his constant helpfulness, and loyal but straightforward advice, he has been of the utmost advantage and assistance to me and my Government. Now that he will be retiring into private life, I wish him all success and happiness " "To me personally he has constantly given the most helpful advice, and I think our colleagues will all bear witness to the great assistance he has rendered to the Council over many difficult and knotty problems. And remember that we have been through no ordinary times. The stress of War has brought anxieties in its turn to which our predecessors were strangers and through them all it has been to us of the utmost benefit to know from a distinguished Indian at first hand how the varying aspects of our different problems would strike the mind of various sections of educated India. As a member of my Council, I repeat, the presence of Sir Ali Imam has been an asset of the utmost value and it was a source of unmitigated satisfaction to me the other day to pay him the greatest compliment at my disposal by appointing him Vice-President of my Council. His tenure of office has coincided, too, with a great deal of difficult and important work in his own particular

department, and our War legislation has attained to a volume of quite respectable dimensions. Many questions of great technique and difficulty have had to be solved and it is not only the actual legislation that has been placed upon the statute book, but a tremendous variety of problems in which the other departments of the Government have found themselves involved that have required the help and guidance of the Legislative Department under the auspices of Sir Ali Imam for their solution.

At the memorial meeting held at Madras in 1912 in honour of the late Mr. V. Krishnaswami Iyer, Sir Murray Hammick said :

My first acquaintance with Mr. Krishnaswami Iyer was in his work in the Legislative Council, when his genius and sound judgment impressed us all. His mastery over the details of complicated matters astonished every one. Then later, when he became a member of the Executive Council, I had the honour of regarding him as a trusted friend, and for one year I had the pleasure of almost daily conversation and intercourse with him. I learnt to admire his genius, his extraordinary quickness, and above all his intense anxiety to be just to all men, and to do what he thought best for the welfare and advancement of his country. Generous in admiration of others, and full of sympathetic concern for his friends, his companionship will be to me one of the pleasantest of memories. I have thought his character was much like that which the stoic Emperor of Rome ascribed to his father, viz., indifferent to compliment, pertinacious in his inquiries, loyal to his friends, and a wise counsellor.

Sir John Atkinson said at the same meeting :

My acquaintance with the late Mr. Krishnaswami Iyer dates from a comparatively recent period, not more than five years back. But it is a matter of melancholy satisfaction to me that what was begun as a mere official acquaintance across the table of the Legislative Council chamber very rapidly developed into a friendship, the remembrance of which will always be among my cherished possessions. There are many others whose intimacy with Mr. Krishnaswami Iyer was of far longer standing and of far closer a character than mine, but to me too it has been given to feel the fire of brain and glow of heart that gave to Mr. Krishnaswami Iyer so strong and so winning a personality. It was of course mainly in official paths that we were brought together. He had no administrative experience when he joined the Government. As he himself said to me a day or two after that event he was only a learner. But what a learner! It was astonishing how rapidly he mastered not only the methods of Secretariat procedure, but the substance and

intricacies of all the many complicated questions submitted to him. It was in consonance with his character that he should be rapid in making up his mind, tenacious of his opinion and forceful in supporting it. Yet he was always ready to hear, most anxious always to look at every aspect of a question, and incapable of taking a narrow or one-sided view—a man 'that executed judgment and that sought the truth.' It is not necessary for me to speak at length regarding his work as member of the Executive Council. It was his high quality that makes our loss to-day so great. We have lost a colleague who combined in himself all the qualities that make for administrative success, who could ill be spared and whose place it will, indeed, be hard to fill. But great as were the qualities of his intellect, I would rather pay my tribute to his character. It was that which made him such a power for good not only in Madras but throughout India. His ideals were so lofty, his desire to rise to their level so passionate. With him practice and precept ever went hand in hand. He could not bear with the Laodicean temperament. It was anathema to him. Mr. Krishnaswami Iyer's restless energy, exercised, as it always was, in the cause of what he believed to be right, was one of the most admirable traits in his fine character.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCILS

In the Legislative Councils the peoples' representatives have conducted themselves with moderation and self-restraint, and although they have chafed at the restrictions placed upon their activity and usefulness, their resentment has on no occasion broken out in any of those disorderly or violent forms which disfigure the annals of the legislatures of England and of the Dominions. Lord Hardinge has more than once borne high testimony to their work. Their criticism and advice have not been without effect on the policy and administration of the country. But so high is the expectation which the public entertain now-a-days of the legislative councils, and so keen is their sense of the impotence of their representatives from a constitutional point of view,

that nothing can satisfy them hereafter short of the power of regulating the policy, disposing of the finances and controlling the executive. Said Lord Hardinge :

I think I may say with some pride and satisfaction that the debates that have taken place have reached a far higher standard of statesmanship and efficiency than has ever been previously attained. They have taken place with a self-restraint and a mutual courtesy and good fellowship that might well be a model to all legislative bodies. I think I can say from experience gained in different parts of the world that this Council is second to none in the dignity of its proceedings and the good feeling that animates its members."

LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT

As regards municipalities and local boards, our record has been distinctly good. It was perhaps lucky that we began our career in local self-government with a large measure of control vested in the central government, for we have been saved from those depths of inefficiency and corruption into which the possession of unrestrained power seems to have thrown similar bodies in Great Britain. But the continuance of minute control and supervision long after the years of probation have passed, is a serious check on the growth of self-governing bodies, and it is now fully recognised by Government that they should be released from leading strings, entrusted with more powers and endowed with greater financial resources.

BUT THE MASSES?

Thus far we have endeavoured to show that there is a sufficiency of talent and public spirit to fill all the positions of trust and responsibility in the

country and to work all the associations and institutions which conduce to the common welfare. There are some who will readily grant the truth of this proposition, but will say that it is the ignorant and helpless condition of the masses that bars the way to progress. It is true that millions of our people are without the rudiments of education, that they are poor and that politically they are without any experience. But is there any country in the world having a large population where the masses though literate, are in a position to exercise their franchise with discrimination? Are they able to follow discussions of public questions intelligently, weigh the *pros and cons* and come to a decision? Do they make their choice between the competing candidates on their merits? Are they not swayed by prejudice, liable to influence and misled by wirepullers? Says Lord Bryce:

Though it is usually assumed in platform speeches that the audience addressed are citizens of this attractive type, everybody knows that in all communities, not only in Chicago but even in Liverpool, let us say, or in Lyons, or in Leipzig, a large proportion of the voters are so indifferent or so ignorant that it is necessary to rouse them, to drill them, to bring them up to vote.

It is not true that in any country which is now self-governing the people obtained the franchise only after they had secured the blessings of universal education. After all, this objection does not proceed with grace from the members or representatives or apologists of the Indian Government. They have done little as yet towards making elementary education

universal, and it is a double wrong to use the prevailing illiteracy as a reason for denying the people the privilege of choosing their own representatives to make the laws of the land.

CASTES AND CREEDS

Then it is said that there are serious differences of a social and religious kind, numerous castes and creeds, each conscious of its difference from the rest and averse from any association with them. This is unfortunately the case, but the difficulties caused by this defect are grossly exaggerated. It is not true that for political purposes our castes and creeds refuse to commingle. Animosities and jealousies are rapidly yielding to the influence of education and to the sense of common needs, and it is the part of statesmanship to provide occasion for the communities coming together for common purposes. Instead the legislative councils have been made the cause of a separatist tendency between Hindus and Mahomedans, and in one province the separation has recently been extended to local bodies as well. It is to be hoped that this disintegrating principle will not be allowed into other provinces or in the case of other communities. Anyhow signs are not wanting that the leaders of opinion in these communities are coming to realize that the separation should be only for a time, after which in political and municipal matters all communal differences should be ignored. In Madras and parts of the Bombay Deccan the Brahman class has created a feeling of jealousy and distrust against itself. The non-

Brahman, though in an overwhelming majority, finds his class without adequate representation in the services or in the professions, and believes that this result is due to the caste instinct of the Brahman who, having selfishly monopolised the advantages of education and social precedence in the past, is now equally selfishly enjoying its fruits by keeping members of other castes from approaching all modern avenues to preferment and distinction. It does not matter whether the Brahman secures the domination of his caste by deliberate and malicious conspiracy or by an instinctive spirit of exclusiveness which is his biological inheritance; the sense of injustice and long-continued wrong rankles equally, and to-day we have the heart-rending spectacle of certain leaders of the non-Brahmin community opposing the political progress of the country on the ground that they must continue for a long time yet to depend on the impartiality and protection of the European officials from the arrogant ascendancy of the Brahman. The ill-feeling came out in an ugly form when the Public Services Commission visited Madras and has since passed into an acute phase. Let us hope it is at its worst now. Two facts, however, seem to line the cloud with silver. The ascendancy of the Brahman has given way in many places and is certain to be effaced in a generation. Large numbers both of the Brahman and the non-Brahman communities have seen the unwisdom of wrangling with one another to the merriment and advantage of

third parties, and the good influence of these peace-makers and patriots is softening acerbity all round. One duty rests on the Brahman, as being the party having the advantage at present. He must recognise that the attitude of the non-Brahman is not only the natural but inevitable consequence of the past, and must be ready and willing in social relations to pay tender heed to the feelings of the non-Brahman, remembering always how keenly he himself feels the affronts, sometimes real but often fancied, of those whom he blames as unable to forget their political superiority. A little thing, said the poet, may harm a wounded man, and this saying has a physical and also a moral application. When the Mahomedans are grasping the hands of the Hindus in friendship, the non-Brahmans will not, we trust, stand apart from their brethren and cry out against the progress of the country.

A GLANCE ABROAD

After all this evil is not altogether absent from more fortunate countries. In England to-day no reform in education can be proposed without raising in an acute form what is known as the religious difficulty. Lord Haldane said only the other day that a great load of educational sin rested on the shoulders of many right reverend prelates and of non-conformists on this account. And complaints are not unknown that the aristocracy have almost a monopoly of facilities of attaining the great positions of public

life, and that the sons of the poor, though endowed with brains, do not enjoy the share of the posts in public service to which they are entitled. For centuries Europe was deluged with blood by religious wars and the persecution of the Jews by Christian communities, which only ceased the other day, is one of the foul stains on western civilization. England's record in this respect is not altogether white. Roman Catholics first, then Protestants, passed laws against their religious foes and persecuted them with a rancour scarcely less than any that the history of India can show. The fact is that religious toleration and complete religious freedom are principles of which human society had occasional glimpses in the ancient world, but which even Anglo-Saxon peoples have realised in their fulness only within the lifetime of the present generation. The history of India has periods, like those of Asoka and Akbar, in which those principles regulated not only the action of Governments but the social life of the people. No foreign authority is needed to impose them on the polity of India, just as it was not required for their evolution in England. Too many Indians believe without reason that in this matter they are in a special degree the accursed of creation, because they have been taught to believe so. Lest these should despise themselves as irredeemable, we shall present them with one extract out of many that are available to show how free and Protestant England could behave in a time not long past

towards Catholic Ireland. Lord Dunraven writes in *Legacy of Past Years* :

The Penal Code came into existence under William immediately after the Revolution, and was extended under Anne and the first two Georges. It affected all human action and endeavour in every form of life. Catholics were prohibited from sitting in Parliament, and were deprived of the franchise. They were excluded from the Army, Navy, the Magistracy, the Bar, the Bench. They could not sit on Grand Juries or Vestries, or act as sheriffs or solicitors. The possession of arms was forbidden to them. They could not be freemen of any corporate body, and were allowed to carry on trade only on payment of various impositions. They could not buy land nor receive it as a gift from Protestants; nor hold life annuities or mortgages or leases for more than thirty-one years, or any lease if the profit exceed one-third of the rent. Catholics were deprived of the liberty to leave property in land by will. Their estates were divided among all their sons unless the eldest became a Protestant, in which case the whole estate devolved upon him. Any Protestant who informed upon a Catholic for purchasing land became the proprietor of the estate. No Catholic was allowed to possess a horse of greater value than £5, and any Protestant could take the horse for that sum. A Protestant woman landowner was, if she married a Catholic, deprived of her property; mixed marriages celebrated by a Catholic priest were declared null. A wife or a child professing Protestantism was at once taken from under the Catholic husband or father's control, and the Chancellor made an assignment of income to them. Catholic children under age at the time of the Catholic father's death were placed under the guardianship of Protestants. Catholics were excluded from seats of learning. They could not keep schools or teach or act as guardians of children.

If India has more of communal jealousy to-day than other countries, it only means that it requires greater circumspection in making the arrangements and greater safeguards. It cannot render the introduction of popular institutions impossible.

RACE

Defeated on all these counts, the opponent of Indian progress may seek shelter under the argument of race, believing that, as it is an unchangeable factor,

the disqualification imposed by it is irremovable. Mr. Curtis, for example, contends that the Asiatic races do not yet possess the faculty of self-government, excepting perhaps the Japanese—the “perhaps” is meant to prove the extreme caution of his thought and reluctance to make any exception. God made the Westerns to rule and the Easterns to obey. They are the Kshatriyas and Shudras respectively of creation. What is it but a revival of the caste system without its spiritual sanction? “Race” is one of those ideas, difficult to analyse and difficult to define, which have come down to us from the past, breeding contempt and hatred between peoples, and used as if it were a charter from heaven by those who have succeeded to warn off those who wish to succeed. Even negroes and pariahs, when carefully educated, are capable of assimilating the civilization of Europe and following any profession with credit. Stress of circumstances may compel a pleasure-loving people to take to arms in self-defence or seek their fortune in wild and hazardous occupations. A hardy and warlike people may become through a long period of peace tillers of the soil or votaries of learning. Scientists and historians may have erudite theories on race and racial characteristics, but the soul of man will revolt against the unblest doctrine that one portion of mankind is for ever to rule and another portion of mankind is for ever to bend its neck to the yoke. Here are a few passages from thoughtful writers protesting against the eternity of

this summary two-fold classification. Dr. Emil Reich, in his book called *Success among Nations*, says :

Amongst many latter-day historians it has been the fashion to seek an explanation of national pre-eminence in race. This method certainly has the advantage of flattering national vanity, but it cannot claim any great scientific value, as the problems it deals with, though expressed in a different set of terms, are not brought any nearer solution. In nearly every instance the racial threads from which a white nation is woven are so inextricably intertwined that it would be quite impossible to determine, even with approximate exactitude, what is the predominant element. Let us, then at once set aside the hypothesis of any peculiar virtue inherent in a particular shade of complexion or variety of blood, and seek for a far readier explanation of our facts in the physical conditions under which these nations lived and had their being. We shall then see why it is that the conquering race is so often compelled to bow to the civilization of the vanquished and advance along their line of development. How often has this been the case in Egypt, Babylonia, and even China !

Again :

The most ingenious books have been written endeavouring to apply the theory of race to the explanation of the rise of intellect among nations. But the racial theory has been ridden to death. After a long struggle, it is now being eventually abandoned by its most fanatical adherents in the ranks of modern historians. But the average man still pins his faith to it. The ordinary Englishman still attributes, and will continue to attribute, the success of his nation to the predominance of the Anglo-Saxon stock ; there is something extremely flattering to national pride in the notion. It also permits of a rapid and complete annihilation of the so-called Latin races. The Frenchman is also fired by a kindred admiration of all that has issued from the Gallo-Roman blood, a theory which also allows of the equally rapid and complete disposal of all that is Teutonic and Anglo-Saxon. We have already shown how absolutely impossible and inapplicable such theories are in the scientific study of history. Race is quite impossible of identification, and where we can to some extent follow out the lines of ethnographical demarcation, it does not in any degree correspond with the national frontier. We must seek for some more substantial basis on which to found our theories of the causes of intellectual growth.

Jean Finot has demonstrated in *Race Prejudice* the impossibility " of attributing immutable

psychological qualities to certain peoples "or races."

"Their virtues and their vices," he concludes, "are only the effects of historic circumstances or of the influence of the milieu." "Savage peoples," he says, "enter triumphantly into our civilization just as civilised peoples fall back into barbarisms. . . . Within the space of fifty years the Negroes have realised as much progress as many white peoples have done in five or six centuries." "The history of civilization is only a continual come and go of peoples and races. All, without distinction of their biological characteristics, are summoned to this great struggle for life wherein we fight for human progress and happiness. All the ethnical elements can take part in it, all can contend for places of honour in it. Such is the general import of our biological and psychological equality, which remains intact underneath all our superficial divisions." "In one word, the term race is only a product of our mental activities, the work of our intellect, and outside all reality. . . . Races, as irreducible categories, only exist as fictions in our brains. They exist in us but not outside us.

Mr. John M. Robertson, M. P., in his paper on *The Rationale of Autonomy* contributed to the first Universal Races Congress held in 1911 writes :

"It really amounts to confessing that all peoples who have not hitherto governed themselves are relatively undeveloped; that, in short, self-government is the pre-requisite of any high level of social organization and general capacity. This implication, however, is not always avowed, even by the more thoughtful exponent of imperialism in our own day; and until recent times it was rather the exception than the rule of historians even to note that when, in ancient Greece and Rome, an end was put to the life of free discussion and political conflict, the general level of human faculty began to sink. The truth that the habit of constant debate and the perpetual practice of affairs are the vital conditions of intellectual and moral betterment for communities as wholes, is still far short of being a current axiom. Yet it is proved alike by the decay of the classic civilizations after the ending of autonomy and by the advance of modern civilization hand in hand with autonomy." The contemporary problem may be put in a nutshell. Are the subject races of to-day progressing or not? If yes, they must be on the way, however slowly, to a measure of self-government. If not, the domination of the advanced races is a plain failure; and the talk of *beneficent rule* becomes an idle hypocrisy." "But the first thing to be posited is a warning that 'difficulty' and 'ill-

preparedness' are in no way special to the cases of tropical countries and so-called 'backward' races. The critical process applied to these cases by those who commonly fall back on the formula of 'fitness' is extraordinarily imperfect. On their own view, those races are 'fit' which have slowly attained self-government after starting on the journey at a notably low stage of 'fitness' and undergoing on the way all manner of miscarriages, including civil war. Only by development out of unfitness, obviously, is fitness attainable. Yet the bare fact of unfitness is constantly posited as if it were the fixed antipodes of fitness. It is commonly put, for instance, as the decisive and final answer to any plea for the gradual development of self-governing institutions in India, that if India were evacuated by the British forces there would ensue civil war, if not a new war of conquest. That is of course an even superfluously valid argument against the evacuation of India, which no politician is known even ever to have suggested. But it is put as if the bare potentiality were a demonstration of the unfitness of the Indian peoples collectively for any kind of institution tending ever so remotely towards autonomy. Now, within the English-speaking world, the mother country had civil wars in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; there was civil war between mother country and colonies towards the end of the eighteenth; and again within the independent United States and within Canada in the nineteenth—all this in a 'race' that makes specially high claims to self-governing faculty. On the imperialist principle, a Planetary Angel with plenary powers would have intervened to stop the 'premature experiment' of Anglo-Saxon self-government at any one of the stages specified—if indeed he had ever allowed it to begin." "The demand that the latter shall maintain an attitude of humble acquiescence for an indefinite time in the hope that when they have ceased to ask for anything they will spontaneously be given it, is quite the most senseless formula ever framed in any political discussion. Peoples so acquiescent would be the most thoroughly unfit for self-government that have yet appeared. They would be one longer 'viable'."

Sir Charles Bruce, in his paper on "The Modern Conscience in relation to the Treatment of Dependent Peoples and Communities," contributed to the same Congress, says:

In conclusion it is submitted that in the treatment of dependent peoples and communities the modern conscience rejects as a fallacy the claim of western civilization to a monopoly of the capacity of self-government based on an indivisible inter-relation between European descent, Christian,

ity, and the so called white colour. It recognises that, while this inter relation has evolved a capacity for self-government in an appropriate environment, a similar capacity has been evolved by an interrelation of other races, creeds and colours appropriate to other environments. It maintains therefore, that the conflict between West and East must be adjusted of the same principle that has adjusted the conflicts of race and creed in the West, the principle of freedom interpreted as liberty of person and conscience and equality of opportunity for all, without distinction of race, creed, or colour, under a settled government." "History, reason, and recent experience in Japan warn us that the adjustment must be made not in the spirit of the popular refrain, East is East and West is West, but in the spirit of a nobler poetic formula:

God's in the Occident,

God's in the Orient.'

This is the spirit of the modern conscience in the treatment of dependent peoples and communities."

NOT YET

The theory of unfitness appears in another shape, not so uncompromising, but not less dangerous. The unfitness, say some critics, is not incurable; in course of time, under careful and benevolent political education such as our slowly-broadening institutions afford, it is possible, though prophecy in such matters is proverbially foolish, that the people of India may become fit for self-rule. But that day is not yet. Wait, wait in patience. Then our mentors resort to metaphor. The way is long and weary, full of peril and adventure. Do you know how they toiled and travailed who went before you, what trials and tribulations they had to bear? Metaphor and proverb, fable and parable, history and epic, teach us a good deal; they give us warning and guidance. But they are not actual life, they cannot replace direct experience either for individuals or communities. The best training is obtained when you grapple with your

difficulties by yourself, the highest and most useful part of education is self-education. The people of India will become fit for self-rule only by practising self-rule. There is no other way for it. They must conceive their aims and ideals, they must lay their plans and execute them, make mistakes and rectify them, incur losses and recoup them, encounter perils and overcome them. Mr. L. Curtis, in his book *The Problem of the Commonwealth*, writes :

In the first place, the exercise of responsibility tends to increase fitness for exercising it. As every one finds in his own experience, it is in having to do things that a man learns how to do them and develops a sense of duty in regard to them. And that is why political power is and ought to be extended to whole classes of citizens even when their knowledge and sense of responsibility is still imperfectly developed.

True, this process should not begin too early; there must be a period of preliminary training. What is the period required? The answer is, till the necessary general, intellectual and moral equipment is acquired, till the necessary political experience has been gained. Our contention is that we have this necessary equipment and experience. In so far as such comparison is possible, we cannot see that India is less fitted to-day than the Philippines for self-rule, nor that her general condition is much behind the condition of Canada or the other Dominions when they had the gift of responsible government, and we go further and say that England and Japan appear to have had nearly as many short-comings as India now has when they adopted a fully popular constitution. The Emperor of Japan took the great

Charter oath in 1869; in 1881 he promised to grant a constitution in ten years; and in 1890 the first Imperial Diet was summoned. The Filipinos have had less than twenty years' schooling in civilized administration. Are Indians so much worse than the Filipinos, or is the school of British political institutions so much slower than that of American political institutions that it takes a century, and how much longer one cannot say, to complete the process of education in the one case which in the other is completed in twenty years? The first legislative council met in Canada in 1792. In fifty years full responsible government was granted. In New South Wales the first Parliament met in 1843. The first responsible ministry took office in 1856. Indians were first admitted to the legislative council in 1861, though it had been in existence for many years. It is not generally known, but it is a remarkable fact that, during this first period, when Europeans enjoyed the exclusive right of legislation for India, they conducted business in regular parliamentary style, with their own standing orders, calling the acts of the executive in question and carrying on debates which in their range and breezy freedom contrast markedly with the prudish and correct respectability of present-day proceedings. Beginning in 1861 on a scale which was caution itself, the non-official Indians admitted to the council being few and nominated, and the council itself never meeting except when there was a legislative measure to be placed before it, we

did not take a second step till more than thirty years had passed. In 1892 after a good deal of popular agitation, the number of non-officials was increased slightly, they were still nominated in form, but practically elected by delegates of local bodies, a limited power of interpellation was given them, and the annual budget was placed before them for discussion, but it was not to be voted upon. Seventeen years passed and strong agitation had to be made before the third step was taken in 1909. This time local legislatures were to have non-official majorities, members in the councils could put supplementary questions and move resolutions on subjects of public interest, subject however to too many exceptions and to the further proviso that, even if accepted by the council, they were not to be binding on the executive. These reforms were introduced with a great fanfare of liberal sentiment, and generally hailed by the people as a substantial improvement. But the seven years that have passed since have been marked by an enormous advance of political thought and political ambition in the people, and the councils are spoken of by the advanced school as glorified debating clubs. In fact, the executive government is still practically master of the situation and carries measures in the teeth of public opposition. After fifty-five years people's representatives have still nothing like constitutional power in the land. Surely our progress is none too hurried. The foundations have had ample time to settle down and can now

carry the full weight of the structure of self-government.

OBJECTIONS

EDUCATED OLIGARCHY

The next objection to be noticed is that, if the scheme came into operation, it would establish the reign of the few who are educated over the many who are uneducated, we should have an oligarchy of a few hundred thousands controlling the destinies of vast millions. You reply that, taking numbers only into consideration, the change will be a big step towards popular government, as the present ruling class does not exceed a few thousands. "But we have knowledge," say they, "of rural life and of the dumb millions, which you, educated gentry dwelling in towns, cannot and do not care to acquire." "It is not so," we rejoin; "the gulf of antipathy and contempt between educated and uneducated is a fable by which you deceive yourselves. The educated come mostly from villages and keep in constant touch with village life. In fact, the most notorious evil of the present administration is that it is run by people who come from over the sea, never learn the vernaculars sufficiently well for ordinary conversation and depend throughout their service on interpreters. Besides, they maintain an attitude of proud exclusiveness which differs in kind and manner of display from the ancient arrogance of the Brahman, but is a far more effectual barrier to sympathy and mutual trust; in fact it is now an article of creed with them that India and

Indians are unfathomable mysteries and that, the longer one remains in the country, the more convinced one becomes of the impossibility of ever understanding its people and their nature and modes of thought and life." "But the lower classes look to us for protection, they remember the old misrule and tyranny from which we rescued them, and will not consent to the transfer of power from us to you, their social oppressors for ages." "Our history, like the history of other peoples, shows periods of good rule and bad rule, of social well-being and social misery, of progress and decay. When you came you found us in one of our unfortunate phases, disorder and the breaking up of an empire met your eyes and helped the establishment of your dominion. The oppression of the lower by the upper classes is nothing peculiar to the East. Before the dawn of the modern humanitarian age, the annals of Europe were disfigured by similar abuses and tyranny. Plato long ago said that in every city there were two cities, that of the rich and that of the poor. To-day, even in the most liberally governed countries, the peasants and the labourers may be heard to denounce the learned folly and the selfishness of those that make the laws and work them for their own benefit, while all the time professing to help and relieve the masses. Ideas of social amelioration and service and higher standards of government have been learned by the educated men in India, and as they have incomparably greater interest in the prosperity of the country and far more

knowledge and sympathy to inspire their efforts, there is no danger of a revival of the old days of caste domination and heartless tyranny. The new oligarchy then will be at least as good as the present." One doubts whether this ancient fiction about the protection of the masses is believed any more even by those in whose interest it is kept alive. Is it the indigenous Short or the oversea Codlin who opposes the spread of education among the people and uses their illiteracy as an argument for opposing political advance? Is it the indigenous Short or the oversea Codlin who defends the pernicious excise policy of the Government on the ground that every man must have his tastes, and likewise approves of the raising of the State demand on land at every resettlement on the ground among others that money left in the ryot's hands goes to the drink shop? Who allows the country to be flooded with cheap free trade goods and refuses to foster the industries of the people in the only way in which other countries, including Great Britain and her colonies, have fostered theirs? Who was responsible for the currency legislation of a few years ago, which, but for some fortuitous happenings which told in his favour, might have hit the poor agriculturist hard, while relieving the Government of the exchange difficulty in paying off the heavy Home charges? Who at the same time gave the European services the exchange compensation allowance in cynical disregard of the tax-payer's interests? Who

to-day, when extravagance is treason and luxuries of every kind are denounced as crimes, keeps up the exodus to the hills for half the year and sanctions extra allowances to Civilian officers for promotion delayed, while at the same time cutting down expenditure on education? Who is going to defend the interests of the voiceless and voteless tax-payer, when in consequence of the report of the Public Services Commission the organised and well-paid Services will drive the Government of India mad with all sorts of claims for increased emoluments? The unfortunate Indian Short, in a hopeless minority in the Council, must set up a piteous wail, which, however, will be drowned in the noise of Codlin's trumpet announcing to an astounded world his protection of the Indian masses against their own heartless countrymen.

It is certainly not political wisdom to keep the educated classes out of their own on the overdrawn plea that the European must continue to play Providence to the masses of India. Their ambition, to put it no higher, is not a vice to be condemned and put down. It is the witness of the eternal principle of progress implanted in man, coloured as well as colourless, and those that condemn it condemn the noblest part of themselves. Lord Durham put the matter none too strongly when he wrote :

As long as personal ambition is inherent in human nature, and as long as the morality of every free and civilized community encourages its aspirations, it is one great business of a wise Government to provide for its legitimate development. If, as it is commonly asserted, the disorders of these colonies

have in great measure, been fomented by the influence of designing and ambitious individuals, this evil will best be remedied by allowing such a scope for the desires of such men as shall direct their ambition into the legitimate channel of furthering, and not of thwarting their Government. By creating high prizes in general and responsible Government, we shall immediately afford the means of pacifying the turbulent ambitions, and of employing in worthy and noble occupations the talents which now are only exerted to foment disorder. We must remove from these colonies the cause to which the sagacity of Adam Smith traced the alienation of the provinces which now form the United States: we must provide some scope for what he calls 'the importance' of the leading men in the colony, beyond what he forcibly terms the present 'petty prizes of the paltry raffle of colonial faction'.

Mr. Curtis too deprecates the talent of educated and competent men being allowed to run to waste.

Citizens who have actually developed the capacity for government will tend to lose it unless it is used to the full. Their knowledge and sense of responsibility will not only be wasted, but will languish for want of exercise. They will not be brought into touch with the ultimate facts of political decisions in which they themselves have shared. They will become a weakness instead of a strength to the commonwealth. The state positively suffers from excluding from political responsibility any class of citizens who have clearly developed a knowledge and sense of duty sufficient for the task. There is always room, therefore, for the further extension of responsible government, and there is always the necessity for it. More men can be made more free by being made more responsible for the conduct of public affairs, and by being put in a position in which, while they suffer for mistakes, they share in the power of correcting them.

THE MARTIAL RACES WILL RISE

The last objection that we shall deal with in this section is that the material races, believing that the Government of the land has passed into weak hands when it passed into Indian hands, will raise the standard of revolt and shake the new regime at the very start. In the first place, this cannot be true of either the Mahomedans, the Sikhs, or the Marathas,

who have drunk deep from the fountain of patriotism. In the second place, when service in the army is thrown open to all who are physically fit and promotion is within the reach of all who are worthy, irrespective of race or colour, the distinction between martial and unmartial people will disappear in the course of a generation. But the real answer to this objection is that it would apply only to a scheme which sought to take India out of the British Empire and completely eliminated the strong arm of the British from Indian affairs. Our critics may choose for their own alarmist purposes to misrepresent the effect of our proposals or the motive that underlies them. But, as a great man once said, "You may fool some of the people all the time and all the people some of the time, but not all the people all the time." The scheme has for its aim and purpose the continued maintenance of British supremacy in India and the reconciliation of her peoples to the suzerainty of the British empire, which has done them incalculable good, giving them hope of a nationhood that they had lost or never possessed, and admitting them to a share of the noblest inheritance of modern civilization, *viz.*, democratic freedom. The sentiment of devotion to the British Commonwealth conveyed in the following passage from Mr. Curtis, omitting the phrase which refers to the sense of kinship, will find a heartfelt echo in the bosoms of most political leaders of India :

Their devotion to it, however consecrated by a sense of kinship, is finally rooted in the belief that the Commonwealth

is the greatest institution in the world for enabling men to realize the duty of governing themselves. It is mainly because they know that it stands for the cause of self-government, and that with its destruction that cause would languish, that they find themselves ready to devote their lives and their wealth to keep it inviolable.

WILL ENGLISHMEN RENOUNCE POWER?

THEIR MISSION IN INDIA

Many who grant the essential justness of the foregoing reasoning may still feel that due account has not been taken of the human element in the problem. Is it to be expected that the Anglo-Saxon, who has come to believe that his special mission is to dominate or, as he prefers to call it, to elevate the weaker races of the world, will renounce the power that has come into his hands? England is truly the home of freedom, but Mill said that all men love power more than liberty. The saying has peculiar force if the power is yours and the liberty is other men's. This is true of most individuals, but there are occasions of moral fervour when it is not true of some high-souled men and women. And there are periods in the history even of aggressive nations when it has not been true of them collectively. In this sense a nation may be nobler than the individual, its genius higher than the tendency of the average citizen. A broad survey of the history of England leaves the impression that, despite great lapses, the spirit of her civilization is a love of free institutions for all. The Government of England, moving within the restraints imposed by diplomacy and traditional policy, has not always championed the cause of freedom. But the

great heart of England has ever beaten in sympathy with struggling peoples, whether it be in revolted America, revolutionary France, Italy, Greece or Belgium. Slavery, which was a great blot on human civilization till recently and involved ancient empires in moral ruin, was abolished first in England. And her shining example has spread over the civilized world. Serfdom and contract labour, which are modified forms of slavery, have nearly ceased to exist in the British Empire, and the knell of indentured labour in India has been sounded. Political subordination remains, but the conscience of England no longer justifies it in its nakedness, but as a necessary preparation of unfit communities for liberty. Often alas! some of her representatives call liberty a shibboleth, and some of her proconsuls in the east have denied her mission and committed wanton aggressions in the name of empire. But nemesis has followed close upon their heels and sooner or later their misdeeds have been converted into benefactions. Malcolm and Elphinstone are only two of a large number of high-souled British administrators who dreamed of an India which should no longer need the support of England. The enunciation of a noble and humane policy may occasionally be mixed with a certain amount of cant, but it has a way of becoming imbedded in political thought and purifying the springs of political action. It has been said that evolution is a spiral movement, backward and forward, but in the long run more forward than back-

ward. So is it with British rule in India. A few years ago we seemed to be swept back by a mighty tide of reaction. The officials of the time seemed deliberately to forswear the beneficence and magnanimity of their predecessors. An exponent of this phase of political thought, approved and belauded by officials themselves, M. Joseph Chailley, writes:

It was so at one time, in the era of Malcolm and Mountstuart Elphinstone (about 1830), and even after the mutiny, when the British considered their mission in India as being to educate the people, to make a nation of them, and to prepare them for the task of self-government. That task accomplished, in the course of a century or two, they would retire, leaving it to its own destinies, a glorious child of their genius. But this conception is not now that of the generality of Englishmen, though it has still some few adherents—Sir Henry Cotton, for instance, who presided over the National Congress of 1904, British opinion, whether in India or the mother country, would now no longer consider a policy of evacuation; the ties which bind India to England are too strong. India is one of the main pillars upon which the grandeur of the British Empire rests; and England will not willingly let her go. Had England taken as her motto, 'India for the Indians,' had she continued, following the ideas of Elphinstone and Malcolm, to consider her rule as temporary, she might, without inconsistency, grant to the national party gradual and increasing concessions, which in time would give entire autonomy to the Indians. But that is not now her aim. She rules India, and intends to go on ruling it. She has against her a Hindu minority; for her, other minorities—Mussalmans, Buddhists and Parsis—and the great mass of the Hindu population. She is ready to bestow on the national party honours and posts in increasing numbers, but she will make no compromise in the matter of principle. She will keep the Command and direction of the vessel, and her Government will remain as despotic as circumstances will permit. Macaulay said in 1835: We know that India cannot have a free government, but she can have the next best thing, a strong and impartial despotism. Seventy years later, Sir Edward Baker, the late Indian Finance Minister, took up practically the same position. India is and must remain, he said, a portion of the British Empire and must in the last resort be subject to the control of the British Government. Complete autonomy would be inadmissible as regards internal administration; still more so as regards military matters and external

policy. Any projects of radical reform would be shattered (shattered?) against this firm decision, which can only be overcome by "force"

But this is treason to God's law, which is love and beneficence. It could not prevail for ever, and Malcolm and Elphinstone must be vindicated. The better mind of England has reasserted itself in the direction of Indian policy and is aptly expressed by Sir Theodore Morison in this passage:

In the background of every Englishman's mind is probably to be found the conviction that it is our duty so to govern India that she may one day be able to govern herself, and as an autonomous unit take her place in the great confederation of the British Empire. This is the ultimate justification of our Asiatic dominion, and a statesman who ventured to advocate the alternative policy that India should be kept in a state of perpetual vassalage, as the milch cow of England, would be hooted from public life.

BLOOD TIES NOT ESSENTIAL

If hope is immortal, so unfortunately seems doubt, The pessimist has his own reading of history. The British, he fears, have granted freedom only to people of their own blood. The examples of the French Canadians and the Boers fail to convince him. In both cases there were British people to whom responsible government had to be given, and care was taken that they had the balance of political power in their hands. The Filipinos, who might be a clear case in point, are unfortunately outside the British Empire. Ireland's fate still hangs in the balance; even there the Ulster Protestants, who are mainly British, must be excluded from Home Rule or conciliated by adequate guarantees. History then has no exact parallel to comfort us. But we

have England's pledge and, in spite of our pessimistic friend, we are on the line of progress. Why may it not be our good fortune to be, within this world-wide empire, the first non-British people to obtain self-government by peaceful and constitutional methods only? As Mr. Gokhale once said, the history of the world is not finished; many chapters have yet to be added to it. One bright chapter under the grace of God may be the joint contribution of England and India. M. Chailley writes for a class of Anglo-Indians who habitually represent the political movement in India as aimed at the expulsion of the British and the complete severance of the country from the British Empire. This aim did not actuate any but a small knot of revolutionaries and that for a time. The furious denunciation, therefore, of M. Chailley and his friends leaves our withers unwrung. We ask that the Britisher's privileged position in India should cease, that in our own country and indeed throughout the British Empire we should be no wise inferior, by reason merely of race, birth, colour, or religion, to any class of His Imperial Majesty's subjects, and that we should be allowed hereafter, Dominion-fashion and in fulfilment of solemn pledges, to regulate the internal affairs of our motherland. No more humiliating restrictions for the individual, no more economic subservience for the community, no more political subordination except as to imperial interests and the Crown's prerogatives. Why does the demand of such an elementary principle of

modern civilization as the absolute equality of all before the law bring violent imprecations on our heads? It is on record that when the little garrison of Arcot ran short of provisions, Clive's sepoys said to his soldiers, "You eat the rice, we'll drink the *conjee*." Surely the good souls did not think at the time that it should be "rice to you and *conjee* to us" for ever. No; this question, once raised, must be set at rest, or it will come up again and again. Unsettled problems, as Burke said once, have no consideration for the repose of nations. Hope is for man, not men; there is no monopoly in freedom. Bright, speaking of Ireland, was led by the logic of his thought to widen it out:

I have never maintained that Irishmen are not at liberty to ask for and, if they could accomplish it, to obtain the repeal of the Union. I say we have no right whatever to insist on a Union between Ireland and Great Britain upon our terms only. I am one of those who admit, as every sensible man must admit, that an Act which the Parliament of the United Kingdom has passed, the Parliament of the United Kingdom can repeal; and further, I am willing to admit that everybody in England allows, with regard to every foreign country, that any nation, believing it to be its interest, has a right both to ask for and to strive for national independence.

Similarly, Lord Durham, in writing of Canada, was unconsciously pleading for other peoples as well. Sir Charles Lucas in an eloquent passage draws out the implications of the noble lord's doctrine.

To all times and to all sorts and conditions of men he has preached the doctrine that for peoples, as for individuals, the one thing worth living for is to make, not to destroy; to build up not to pull down; to unite small disjointed elements into a single whole; to reject absolutely and always the doctrine of *divide et impera*, because it is a sign of weakness, not of strength; to be strong and fear not; to speak unto the peoples of the earth that they go forward. In the constructiveness, which is embodied in all parts of the Report, he has, beyond any other man, illustrated in writing the genius of the English race,

the element which in the British Empire is common alike to the sphere of settlement and to the sphere of rule.

The idealists of Europe, here is Lord Bryce's word for it, have dreamed of happiness for all people alike flowing from the establishment of free institutions.

But from 1830 to 1870 the general attitude of most of the powerful intellects and nearly all the finest characters among the thinkers and writers of Europe was a hopeful one, expecting immense gains to human progress and human happiness from the establishment of free institutions. These expectations have been in so far realised that the condition of all the countries where such institutions now exist shows a marked improvement in the condition of the masses of the people, an improvement due not merely to the advance of science and consequent diffusion of comfort, but also to a juster and more humane legislation. Nobody denies that our world of to-day is a better world for the common man. Few deny that this is largely due to better political institutions. A striking evidence of this general conviction is to be found in the efforts which Japan and Russia have made, which Persia and the Turks are beginning to make, for the establishment of parliamentary institutions. Even in China these have been talked of: *De conducendo loquitur iam rhetore thule.*

CONCLUSION

OUR DUTY

Everywhere men are asking one another: "What will come of it all?" They would fain penetrate the veil that hides the future. The result depends on a number of more or less incalculable factors, but one of these, and not a negligible one, is the earnestness and strength of the effort made by the people of India. Though it may not be flattering to our vanity, it must be acknowledged that we have not yet mastered the art of political agitation. The machinery of government in Great Britain is moved by public opinion. Those that are keen on getting anything done have to secure its support. This is got

up by a persistent campaign of writing in newspapers, lectures, deputations, and other demonstrations, more or less noisy. Some movements have organs of their own and a corps of paid agents. The interest of members of Parliament, front bench men preferably, has to be obtained if the Cabinet has to take action. When the Colonies obtained Parliamentary legislation for responsible government and other great objects, they sent over deputations, and some members thereof stayed in London for long periods. When the Bills were drafting, they must have had several private interviews with men of consequence. In India the imperative need of this work is not sufficiently recognized. Our difficulty in this respect is specially great, because we have to contend against the influence of the reactionary members of the Government of India, the India Office, the great bulk of retired Anglo-Indians and the numerous conservative organs of the press. Our exertions must therefore be strenuous and unceasing, our sacrifices heavy in proportion. Nor must work in India be neglected. In many ways it is not less, but more, important than agitation in England. When the end of the War is in sight, numbers of enthusiastic workers must carry the gospel of self-government for India under the British flag into every nook and corner of the land, pamphlets and leaflets, besides articles in the press, must rain on the country in English and in the vernaculars, and memorials, preferably translations of one and the same original, signed by tens of thousands of people.

must be got ready for transmission to the authorities. Representatives of Indian opinion, men of light and leading in every locality, all who have any opportunities of conversation with officials, must not shrink, when asked, from proclaiming their wholehearted adherence to the Congress scheme. It should not be possible for any officer in any corner to report to Government, confidentially or otherwise that he did not hear much of the self-government movement in his jurisdiction. Despite all these manifestations of popular enthusiasm, it is probable that the fulfilment of our aspiration will be long in coming. Disappointments and discouragements, mockery and abuse may assail us at every turn. Threat and persecution may be the portion of some of the patriots actively engaged in the cause. Nothing, however, should be allowed to turn us aside from our undertaking. There will arise frequent occasions for change of plan, increased vigilance, more man-power. But occasion for despair there cannot be. God's grace must rest on all righteous causes. No obstacle can stand before a nation's will. We have only to teach the nation to form this will, and all can help in this work.

TAKE OCCASION BY THE HAND

The truth will bear repetition that in British polity great changes may be brought about by the sole means of constitutional agitation. It is the boast of English historians that by timely concessions and adjustments their statesmen have as a rule averted violence and revolution. Let our workers, young and

old, remember always that a good cause does not need to be served by bad means. We shall perhaps have provocation now and then from underlings; a small man, dressed up in a little brief authority, may occasionally do a stupid thing. The exuberant imagination with which we have been credited should enable us to make due allowance for the extreme difficulty of the European's position in India. A few thousands among vast millions, they have excuse if in times of political excitement they yield to unjust suspicion and act in panic. Our movement will not lose but gain in the end by being conducted with restraint and dignity. If violence there must be, let it be what others inflict on us; if suffering, let it be what we bear; if sacrifice, let it be what we make, not what we exact. The time is full of hard problems for British statesmen. They can attend to none which are not urgent and cannot by any possibility be put off. Even in ordinary times, if a question has not sufficient momentum of public opinion or even clamour behind it, other questions will take precedence. The habit of politicians in England is to judge the urgency of a matter by the noise it has made and by the earnestness of the men that champion it. In this struggle for attention it often happens that a movement wins on account of the trouble that it has caused the administration and the disorderly manifestations it has made of its strength and intensity. It must be admitted that we in India are not good at attracting the notice of the authorities and guardians of the

public peace in these ways. We lie under a peculiar disadvantage in that even youthful indiscretion is branded by inconsiderate authorities as a symptom of sedition or disloyalty. Tests of a different kind must therefore be applied to our movements. *The Times of India* the other day pleaded for a complete change in the mode of action of British ministers. I admonished them for waiting till they *must* act. To some extent it is a condition imposed by the congestion of Parliamentary work, but it is also the inevitable result of democracy or government by the people.

Yet under the British system Mr. Asquith has had to draw his whole inspiration from the country instead of leading and influencing the country; one result is that in all major preparations the Empire has had to wait until the good sense and patriotism of the people have gathered sufficient momentum to drive the Government to action. It does not require much mental effort to see at what a disadvantage this places the British Empire when at death grips with a Government that really governs—which with a vast organised body of expert knowledge at its disposal is able to act in advance of public opinion without waiting until the mass of people, who with their imperfect knowledge necessarily see things more slowly, have made up their minds that action shall be taken.

To Indians who are peace-loving, full of trust in the authorities and accustomed to leave the initiative to them, the change of attitude here recommended will be a blessing. The old ideal of the good and wise king who went about among his people in search of wrong and suffering that he might give redress before the tear was shed or the curse spoken still holds our imagination. It cannot be a sound polity where the normal practice is to meet a situation only when it has developed undesirable symptoms.

The Need for Political Reform

In the course of the Budget debate in the Imperial Legislative Council in March 1917, Mr. Sastri referred at the end of his speech to the urgency of political reforms in India. Mr. Sastri pointed out that H. E. Lord Chelmsford's Viceroyalty would above all be marked by the inauguration of a scheme which was then exercising the earnest attention of the Government of India and His Majesty's Government at Home. In urging the need for Reforms, Mr. Sastri said :—]

IT has been pointed out, My Lord, several times that at this time of war we ought not to embarrass the Government with any suggestions of ours. I do not know that this thought of what should be done in India to satisfy the growing ambitions of the country is not present night and day to those who have charge of responsible interests either here or in England. We know as a matter of fact the thought is forever present in your minds, in the minds of those with whom you are in daily association in the work of Government in India. If we at this time throw in our counsel so that you may take that into consideration also in settling matters, it is rather hard for us to be accused of seeking to embarrass the Government with our ideas at this time.

It is too little realized, I fear in official circles, or if realised it is conveniently forgotten how intense are the feelings of young India in the matter of realising the great hopes that have been held out from time to time. It is somewhat strange that decades ago when public life was rather low in this country and public demands had not risen to any high pitch, it was left to English administrators and statesmen to lay down in clear and generous terms the policy of continuous improvement which was to end in the final emancipation in a political and economic sense of the people of this country.

Now that during the last few years public opinion has become articulate and people are asking for one thing and another, it is astonishing to think, it is saddening to think, that officials should seem to stand aghast and scared at the coming prospect. What is it that is happening in this country, they seem to say to themselves? My Lord, no one of us, at least no one of us who has thought of the affairs of India in a serious way, desires any catastrophic changes. Far, far be that from our minds. But let me frankly tell Your Excellency and Your Excellency's Government that we do look forward to large, substantial and satisfying items of reform consistently with their being stable and lasting. The only things that we hear amid the official reserve and the official silence in regard to these matters are the views of retired pro-consuls like Lord Sydenham, whose distrust of educated Indians, I venture to state from

this place, is fast becoming a menace to the peace and welfare of this country. My Lord, it was only a few days ago that the Premier of England, referring to the catastrophic change that has come over Russia, spoke of it in terms to which I would venture to draw the attention of the Council. He referred to it with his characteristic insight as 'events marking a world epoch and as the first great triumph of the principles for which we entered the War,' *i.e.*, the dethronement of autocracy and the establishment on a sure footing, let us hope, of popular freedom. We ask for the identical thing in this country. Shall it be said that India was the last country in the world to obtain this great triumph of the principles for which England and India alike are making terrible sacrifices? Let it not be said that any school of English politicians stood deliberately in the way of according to India that popular freedom which they hail in the case of Russia even when it is inaugurated in that catastrophic manner of which we have heard. We want peaceful progress; we want constitutional and ordered progress; we want, however, at the same time that it should be declared clearly to Indians that they shall one day be free. It is necessary in my opinion also to state how soon. Shall it be said twenty or thirty years hence that, at a time when the world was passing through a terrible crisis and the nations stood facing each other, some in friendly co-operation, some in the bitterest hostility, the Indians asked for freedom, but that they were told to 'wait, wait, wait, wait.'

. Your Excellency, it is now time that we were told definitely what it is that we are to expect. I make no doubt whatever that Your Excellency is already contemplating the announcement to India at a seasonable time no doubt of the goal towards which India politically will evolve under the fostering care of the British Government. It strikes me that the hour has long come when that should be made perfectly clear. While there are many authorities, high and low, in the country ready to deprecate and discourage, ready to intern and exclude, there is none—sad thought—high or low, to speak a word of hope, to hold out to the coming generations the promise of freedom for which England has always stood, for which she is striving to-day, and for which both England and India together are striving with one mind and one heart.

“Your Excellency, with these words I wish to resume my seat, expressing once more the hope that to Your Excellency will be reserved the proud distinction of having been able to initiate a large and substantial, though certainly not a catastrophic, scheme of Reform.

Nasik Conference Address

The following is the full text of the Presidential Address delivered at the Seventeenth Bombay Provincial Conference held at Nasik on May, 12, 1917 :—

THE IMPERIAL WAR CONFERENCE

SINCE this Conference met last at Ahmedabad, two events of first-rate importance have happened : the session of the Imperial War Conference at the seat of the Empire, and the adoption of a scheme of post-War Reforms by the Indian National Congress and the All-India Muslim League at Lucknow. The whole country rejoices that the representatives of India were admitted to the Imperial Conference on terms of perfect equality with those of the Dominions and that they everywhere met with the utmost cordiality and consideration, while by their personal bearing and patriotic utterances they have sustained the honour of India and are entitled to our gratitude and appreciation. Touching the actual results of the Conference, the cablegrams so far received, although they contain momentous news, do not enable us to obtain precise notions. In the first place, the members of the Conference unanimously recommended that India should have full representation at future Imperial Conferences and that the Governments concerned should be moved to give their consent to the

arrangement. But what does "full representation" mean? If the representatives of each Government are to have only one vote between them, more significance attaches to the quality of the representatives than to their number. Speaking for myself, the country has been particularly lucky this time in the gentlemen chosen by Government to champion its interests. But luck cannot always be counted upon. The other Governments are composed of elected leaders of the people, and their choice may be held to be the same as the people's choice. In the case of India it may happen that the persons chosen by Government do not command the confidence of the public and that the views which they express at the Conference are conformable to the wishes of the Government but not to those of the country. It would be necessary to secure that the nominees of our Government should have been recommended to them on behalf of the public by some electorate like the elected members of the Indian Legislative Council or the elected members of the Indian and Provincial Legislative Councils. This method is obviously unsuitable to obtain the official representatives or the representatives of the ruling chiefs, should such representatives be required for future Conferences as well. On this, as on other important aspects, however, we have no information to go upon. One observation, however, may be made with absolute certitude. The idea that the Secretary of State can represent the people of India in the Imperial Conference is un-

tenable, if not ridiculous. Says Mr. Silburn on this subject with reference to the Conference of 1907, "It cannot be said that the Secretary of State for India was the proper personage to represent some 294 millions of people at a Conference, the other delegates at which were directly representing the people of countries they were personally acquainted with by long residence." Another matter, but one which affords satisfaction, is that the Conference unanimously approved of the principle of reciprocity between the Dominions and India and commended the memorandum presented by our representatives on our position in those countries, to the favourable consideration of the Dominion Governments. Here, again, till we know the text of the memorandum, we can have no idea what 'reciprocity' connotes and cannot judge the exact gain to our credit.

INDIA AND THE IMPERIAL COMMONWEALTH

A third resolution, transcending the others in far-reaching consequence to India, enunciates some of the principles to be borne in mind when a special Imperial Conference will sit immediately after the War to consider the relations of the component parts of the Empire in the future, in other words, the basis of the future Imperial Commonwealth. One of the principles is that India as well as the Dominions should have an adequate voice in the determination of foreign policy and foreign relations. So far so good. But what about this other principle, that any readjustment should recognise the Dominions as auto-

nomous nations of the Imperial Commonwealth and India as an important portion thereof? Does it mean that our representatives have consented to an arrangement which even in the future will place India on an inferior level to the Dominions? Or does it mean that, though India may see no change in her internal constitution, she will enjoy, so far as the Commonwealth is concerned, equal status with the self-government Dominions; constitutional expedients are no doubt infinite, and the ingenuity of constitution-makers is not easily baffled. But we cannot refrain from asking, how will this equality of status be made compatible with India's position as a Dependency of Great Britain? How can she, in her character as such, cast her vote in the Parliament of the Commonwealth independently of Great Britain, as the Dominions will? If the idea is that, while she has a vote, it will always be cast with Great Britain's, it is only a device to secure the domination of Great Britain, and the boasted equality of India with the Dominions is nominal. Independence of Great Britain in the Commonwealth Parliament is a greater thing constitutionally than independence of Great Britain in internal affairs. Are we to get the greater thing, while we are still to be denied the smaller? On the contrary, the self-governing status appears to us almost a *sine qua non* of India becoming an equal partner in the future Commonwealth. Perhaps, however, we are taking too much for granted in supposing that a Commonwealth with a defined

constitution will take shape as a direct result of the deliberations of the special post-War Conference. Great complexities surround the problem, and informed opinion is by no means unanimous in the United Kingdom or the Colonies as to the feasibility or the desirability of a comprehensive Imperial constitution: Professor Dicey and Sir Wilfrid Laurier, to name only two, have not yet become converts to the new gospel of a Federated Empire. Indian opinion cannot count for much in this mighty issue. In the scheme adopted by the Congress and the Muslim League, it has only one clause to itself, although that clause is comprehensive enough:—"In any Council or other body which may be constituted or convened for the settlement or control of Imperial affairs, India shall be adequately represented in like manner with the Dominions and with equal rights." The governing resolution of the National Congress is briefer still and embraces India's status, both internal and external. "That in the reconstitution of the Empire, India shall be lifted from the position of a Dependency to that of an equal partner in the Empire with the self-governing Dominions." In fact, Indian opinion is by no means enthusiastic for an Imperial Federation. For obvious reasons, it has concentrated on the acquisition of internal autonomy. The people of India believe that, so long as their representatives are nothing in internal affairs, they cannot be anything in external affairs, whatever the constitution may provide; and they believe further that, when India becomes auto-

nomous, she will know how to secure her proper rights in the larger councils of the Empire. Powerful feelings arising from the contemplation of hopes long-deferred, pledges unfulfilled and rights denied, impel Indian politicians to work for self-Government, and those who ignore this circumstance ignore the most vital element in the situation and can never hope to understand the problem of India's aspirations. The logical mind of the Indian perceives an incongruity in the plan of his Anglo Indian brother, who advocates a position of equality for India in the Federation of the Empire but resists the movement for internal freedom. But incongruities and logical flaws do not disturb those who have been brought up to believe in the perfection of the British constitution. To them it is enough that a constitution is workable and bids fair to become a tolerably efficient means of promoting the happiness of the community. So we find Mr. Lionel Curtis sketching the outline of a Federal Parliament with a nominee Upper House and a wholly elected Lower House, in both of which the people of India should be adequately represented, though he knows that they do not enjoy such a privilege in their own country and in fact commends the scheme to their acceptance expressly on the ground that it will provide Indians with a voice in the determination of the steps by which and the pace at which they should advance towards full responsible government in internal affairs. This assumes that the Federation movement outside India will reach

consummation far sooner than the Home Rule movement inside India, which is indeed bidden to wait on such chance as the former may have of success. Which of these two movements is the simpler and more urgent? Mr. Curtis moves with confidence among the considerations that make up the question of Imperial Federation. He does not understand, and is naturally diffident in dealing with, the questions connected with Indian Home Rule. The position of the average Indian politician is exactly the reverse. He is familiar with the many aspects of the nationalist movement in this country, while he walks with unsure steps along the intricate paths that lead to the great Britannic Commonwealth. Each may be pardoned then if he has a different opinion from the other as to which of the two is to come first and which second—Imperial Federation or Indian Self-Government. Mr. Curtis, indeed, has now convinced himself that India can and must have responsible government as soon as possible and is willing to countenance her endeavours in that direction, so far as he considers them proper and legitimate. The average Indian politician is in a worse predicament. He is not satisfied that Imperial Federation must come and is not therefore prepared to grapple with the difficulties of that problem. Scanning the meagre message of Reuter, one reads a note of hesitation and doubt in the resolution of the Imperial War Conference on this particular subject. The cable says, "The readjustment should provide for effective

arrangements for *continuous consultations* on all important matters of common imperial interest and *for such concerted action founded on consultation as the several Governments determine.*" The expressions I have put in italics do not lend themselves to the interpretation that an Imperial Federation is definitely decided upon. On the contrary, an easy and natural construction of the words leads us to suppose that in the opinion of the members of the Conference the problems of the Empire should be solved by frequent meetings of those interested in them, and that the final responsibility was to rest on the several Governments that met in consultation and not on an Imperial organization created for the purpose. If, however, an Imperial Parliament, such as Mr. Curtis adumbrates, is to be brought into being before India gets responsible government, we should welcome the suggestion that India should be adequately represented in both Houses, and in the Lower House by men of her own free choice. Only this condition is indispensable—that the standard of representation must be the same for all alike, population or total contribution made to the Imperial Treasury. Mr. Silburn in his *Governance of Empire* suggests a uni-cameral Parliament for the Federated Empire, with 216 members. When he comes to distribute them, he assigns 67 members to the United Kingdom, 37 to India, 30 to Canada, 16 to South Africa, 12 to New Zealand, 11 to Australia, and so on, thus 're-

cognising in the case of India that "to give this portion of the Empire a voice in its governance commensurate with its importance, it is necessary to make that voice second only to that of the United Kingdom." His basis of representation, however, *viz.*, the size of the legislative bodies in the different countries represented, is arbitrary and liable to fluctuation and even manipulation. Lord Sydenham and other critics do not scruple to discount the representative character of our representatives in the various Councils on account of the smallness of the electorates who choose them. The fact is that it suits the bureaucracy, in their rooted opposition to all democratic movements in the country, to keep the franchise both narrow and indirect. To-day the franchise may be widened enormously with perfect safety and justice, and instead of the non-official members of local bodies electing to the Provincial Legislative Councils and the non-official members of the Provincial Legislative Councils electing to the Indian Legislative Council, it is perfectly feasible to create large and enlightened constituencies directly among the people. Mr. Silburn's standard then must be dismissed. When the Federation enthusiasts do not, like Lord Milner for example, abandon the notions of equality and justice, they are puzzled how to bring India into the organization without giving her a weight and potency which will cast other parts of the Empire into the shade.

OUR DEMAND—THE TIDE IN OUR FAVOUR

My heart swells with pride as I think of the momentous resolution which, in mutual concert, our National Congress and our Muslim League came to in the recent Lucknow session, concerning the progress of our people towards Self-Government. An Indian patriot finds immediately placed in front of him for the first time in the history of our political effort an object worthy of the great nation to which he belongs and the great and varied culture which forms his richest inheritance. Self-Government under the British flag, equal partnership in the British Confederation with the United Kingdom and the oversea Dominions, constitutes a destiny which the proudest people need not scorn. This generation of our public workers must count themselves blessed that they are privileged to see the fair vision of emancipated India gather form so quickly and come into vivid view to inspire them with hope and promise denied to their fathers. These are great days: great destinies are taking shape, great ideas are swaying the hearts of men, and great causes have evoked great enthusiasms and exacted great sacrifices. India has not been a silent spectator; happily removed from the thick of the conflict, she still feels that she has enormous stakes in it and throbs with the most lively interest at every turn and shift in the mighty drama which is in progress in most parts of the world. If no belligerent nation can remain its old self after the War, neither can India be held down to her ancient

moorings. We in India have likewise new dangers ahead, we have likewise to refashion our polity, we must likewise claim a share of the great principles of popular freedom and opportunity of unhindered self-expression which are being reconquered at terrible cost for human civilization. Come then, all of you who live for something beyond the hour, all whose hearts can feel, all whose souls can be fired to high purpose, come all and aid in this great work. Whether you bring much or little, whether you use pen or tongue, let your heart be pure and your resolve manly. Let us not think too much of the risks and the difficulties. They are great, but so are the forces that fight on our side. Indian blood has not been shed, Indian treasure has not been poured out, in vain. Subtle bonds, unsuspected heretofore, have drawn Englishman and Indian together, new ties of brotherliness and comradeship have been confessed on both sides, and England and India have realised as never before how sorely they need each other. Do not believe it, if anybody tells you that the war should not make, and has not made, any change in our mutual relationship. Hard-headed party leaders have experienced a profound change in their dearest convictions on account of the war. Mr. Asquith, for example, is now a whole-hearted advocate of the franchise for women, and Mr. Bonar Law, alluding to his challenged attitude towards the Irish Nationalists and the question of Home Rule gave fine, if

somewhat reserved, expression to his newly awakened generosity :

" I do believe," he said, " that this Irish question does act as a handicap upon us in carrying on this war. I do not agree that perhaps we should do it better when the war is over—I am not sure. I know this at least that in this House I myself, and I think that it is true of many others, have a different feeling towards the gentlemen who sit on the Nationalist benches, because of the attitude taken by the leader of their party and by other members of that party who are risking their lives."

Whatever some Europeans may say here, and some Indians repeat after them, the people in England and in the Dominions have had a new India revealed to them; and the best among them in all political parties have proclaimed their conviction that India should no longer occupy a low place in the Empire and that Indians should no longer be treated as political inferiors or possible rebels, whom it is wise to keep weak and disarmed. The severe tests of war have proved us beyond a doubt, and the general opinion among those qualified to judge is that England must definitely pledge herself to accord the self-governing status to India. The National Congress and the Muslim League have asked for such a declaration from responsible authorities. The idea must have gained strength from the presence of India's representatives at the seat of empire among the leading lights of the empire. One of them Sir S. P. Sinha, had himself pleaded eloquently and passionately for such a declaration when he presided over the Bombay session of the Congress. Even *The Times* of London seems to have felt the need of

a changed attitude towards India. In a recent article that great paper says, "The broad lines of policy in India are perfectly clear ; it looks steadily forward to the gradual increase of the self-governing function and is only concerned to regulate that increase as good order within and the security against external aggression require, but this policy is too seldom expressed in terms." Then it goes on to urge "that an authoritative declaration on the subject should be made now and not as a reply to agitation after the war."

NO REVOLUTION

In acute controversy a disavowal or qualification of a statement cannot be repeated too often. Sometimes in innocence, but sometimes also through perversity, people go on attributing motives and views which you have repudiated and demolishing arguments which you have never advanced. The political reformers of India are accused of advocating the immediate grant of responsible government, and the use by the reformers themselves of the expressions Home Rule and Colonial Autonomy, not in their rigid constitutional significance as applied to Ireland and to the Self-governing Dominions, but as convenient and compendious descriptions of their demands, has been turned against them as an avowal of a desire to bring about revolutionary changes by such tactics as obstruction and intimidation. The extreme nervousness of those who are responsible for peace and tranquility in the country enables us to

understand their proneness to take alarm on insufficient grounds. But it is difficult to find an adequate excuse for their indiscriminating dislike of all political agitation and their reckless condemnation of moderate leaders as revolutionaries. The scheme of changes embodied in the principal resolution of the recent Lucknow Congress is described as a definite step towards self-government. The framers of the scheme have been anxious that its introduction should not require the scrapping of existing machinery or give cause for the suspicion that they were aiming at the subversion of British rule. The forms of administration will remain untouched. The Governor-General, Governors and Lieutenant-Governors, Executive Councils and Legislatures will be there as ever. The great services, the financial system, the judicial system, and the educational system will continue intact. There will be no dislocation in the Departments. No interests like those of commerce or agriculture will be threatened. The free life of no community and the free practice of no religion will be in peril. Military matters, war and peace, and treaty-making will be in the same hands as heretofore. If none of these dire consequences is likely, is it fair or reasonable to spread a panic of coming revolution? We do not wish to conceal the fact that great and substantial changes are contemplated in the scheme. Certain vested interests will suffer; civil authority will change hands, and a great devolution of power will be effected. But these changes, profound as they

are, do not involve 'red ruin and the breaking-up of laws.' What great popular movement, intended to satisfy the ambitions of a people long kept down, was ever attended with less change? Congress leaders have laid themselves open to the charge of weakness and undue regard for the susceptibilities of men in power. They have never been guilty of excess or violence. Bureaucracy, long used to irresponsible power has grown intolerant of criticism and cannot treat political opponents with the broad-mindedness and courtesy, which are characteristic of public life in communities in which civil power has ceased to be the monopoly of a class. Fed up with the belief that the people exist for them, rather than they for the people, they naturally think that anything which threatens their privileged position threatens the very root of the established order of things, and any political agitation, of which the tone is not apologetic, appears to them as dangerous and disorderly propaganda. No caste in India has ever been more jealous of its privileges than the Indian Civil Service. They firmly believe that they know everything, that no department can do without them, and that power not in their hands must necessarily be abused. When it is proposed that an elected majority should pass the legislation of the land, control the finance and criticise the executive administration, they naturally think that the proposal, if carried out, will bring down the whole structure of Indian society and cause irretrievable ruin.

TWO CRITICS

Neither Lord Sydenham nor His Honour Sir Michael O'Dwyer can pause, in their paroxysm or indignation, to distinguish between Swadeshism and Sinn Feinism, between constitutional agitation and anarchist conspiracy, between the enthusiastic Congressman and the maniacal bomb-thrower. "You are a saint", says the Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab, "and your speech is wisdom. But if I fancy that other people misunderstand you, I will shut you up and no mistake". Some assassin took a well-thumbed copy of the Gita to the gallows; that sacred book thenceforward fell under official displeasure. A revolutionary pamphlet contained a quotation from Mazzini; no owner of his works was thereafter free from suspicion. A professor in a town supposed to be infected with sedition delighted in expounding Burke to his pupils; the father of English conservatism was thereupon condemned as unfit for University curricula. Lord Sydenham, the angel of innocence, whose educational zeal the perverse Bombay University mistook for political jealousy, sought, happily in vain, to banish English History from the course of studies for the graduate's degree, because forsooth the virtues of patriotism, love of freedom and brave citizenship which it inculcates are unsuited to Indian youth who must be trained up in the way of submission, servility and sycophancy. Doings like these defeat their own object and create the very evil they are intended to cure. Sir Michael O'Dwyer bade us

the other day cease from our propaganda, lest it should lead impatient youth to the commission of crime. May we, out of gratitude for this lesson in political science, remind His Honour and those who think like him that unbalanced speeches like his sap the faith of the public in the progressiveness and benevolence of British rule, leave the constitutionalist politician without a following, and swell the ranks of the revolutionary school of thought? The mild Congressmen in India do not need this sort of homily. We have never organized armed resistance to lawful authority and threatened open insurrection, though the career of Sir Edward Carson is not exactly a lesson in the duty of loyal submission to the decrees of Parliament. We do not intend any attempt to overthrow by force the established Government of the land, and hope that no revolutionaries in the country have been led to believe that if they succeeded, the House of Commons and the Premier of England would send them an enthusiastic and fervid greeting.

A QUOTATION FOR SIR MICHAEL O'DWYER.

At this point I wish, with all due respect, to make His Honour a present of an apposite quotation from a recent Irish debate in Parliament. Sir Michael O'Dwyer is an Irishman and naturally feels uneasy at the parallelism frequently drawn between the movement for Irish Home Rule and the Indian struggle for self-government, and is at the pains to construct an ingenious argument against it. In one

vital particular His Honour's opinion goes decisively against the cherished conviction of most Irish patriots. He would seem to think that the present distracted condition of Ireland is a consequence, indirect it may be, of the mistakes and excesses of the Nationalist Party. Without a doubt they would reply, to use a homely expression, the boot is on the other leg. At the end of a speech, as remarkable for its self-restraint and patriotism as for its pathos, Mr. John Redmond lamented the way in which the vacillation of Government was weakening his influence in Ireland and disclaimed responsibility for future consequences. He said,

The last time I spoke on this matter I said that in my opinion the Government ought to take their courage in both hands and make a definite proposal. That they have not done. I say, no matter who he is, any British statesman who by his conduct teaches once again the Irish people the lesson that any Nationalist leader who, taking his political life in his hand, endeavours to combine local and imperial patriotism, endeavours to combine loyalty to Ireland's rights with loyalty to the Empire—any one who again teaches the lesson that such a man is certain to be let down and betrayed by this course, is guilty of treason, not merely to the liberties of Ireland, but to the unity, strength and best interests of this Empire. That is the course which, in my judgment, the Irish people will recognise as having been taken by you (indicating the Government front bench), and I warn you of the consequences. How far this action may make the constitutional action in Ireland in the future impossible or not, I cannot say, but certainly the speech of the Right Hon. gentlemen (Mr. Lloyd George), his utter refusal to come down, on the responsibility of the Government, with some definite plan to make an appeal to the patriotism of the First Lord of the Admiralty (Sir Edward Carson), makes one think, 'Why should all appeals be made to us? Why cannot he—he is capable of it, I am sure—rise to the height of sacrifice demanded of him and come forward and agree to a proposal which he knows will be accepted by the whole of Ireland and would end his wretched business?'

NOT THE RIGHT TO SPEAK, BUT THE RIGHT TO RULE

One of our mentors gravely tells us that in the legislatures of the land we have the fullest opportunities for the expression of opinion, and he wonders what more we could want. Why, has it never struck him that we too have learnt to worship at the shrine of freedom? Opportunity for the expression of opinion? The time is gone when that would have contented us. *We want political power; let there be no mistake about it. We want the right to rule ourselves.* Within the last few weeks the world has resounded to the pæans of joy which greeted the establishment of democracy in Russia. Men's hearts were stirred, as they have been rarely in the history of the world, when they read the super message of President Wilson to the American Congress. He said :

Civilization itself seems to be in the balance; but right is more precious than peace, and we shall fight for the things which we have always carried nearest our hearts—for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own government, for the rights and liberties of small nations, for the universal dominion of right by such a concert of free peoples as will bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself free at last.

PROSPEROUS YET DISCONTENTED !

I have recently seen a small collection of American opinions of British rule in this country published by Fisher Unwin and heard with surprise that Government had sent copies of it to newspapers. Does Government fancy, for one moment, that we lack in appreciation of the benefits of British rule here? Few understand them and realise their full measure, as the educated classes do, who have read

accounts of the disorganized condition of this country when the British came on the scene. And yet is it wrong of them to desire self-government? Only a few days ago, in a debate on the condition of Ireland both Mr. Asquith and Mr. Lloyd George referred to the material prosperity that the Irish enjoyed, but neither of them wondered at the serious discontent of that people. Hear what the Prime Minister said:

I want to show that the discontent of Ireland is not material; but still there remains one invincible fact after all this great record of beneficial legislation—in spite of the fact that Ireland is more materially prosperous than she has ever been, there remains the one invincible fact to-day that she is no more reconciled to British rule than she was in the days of Cromwell. It proves that the grievance is not a material one, *it is something which has to do with the pride and self-respect of the people.* I entreat the House of Commons and the British people to get that well into their minds. It is a fact which must be grasped by the House of Commons or by any government which means to attempt a settlement of this question.

On a later occasion Mr. Bonar Law emphasized the same truth.

I know what the views of Nationalist members are and I do not agree with my noble friend that the only thing you have to think of with respect to the government of Ireland is to set up a government that will govern in the best way. I do not think so at all. I think that very often a very bad form of government, if it is with the consent and good-will of the people governed, will work infinitely better than a much better system without that consent and good-will.

WHAT IS REAL LOVE OF LIBERTY?

Historians teach us that the prosperity and glory of ancient empires were hollow, because they were built upon slavery, that even the boasted republics of old had no real freedom because it was denied to the large numbers of slaves who were never included among the citizens of the State. There is no slavery

now in the British Empire, but a huge deduction must be made from the boast that it stands for the principles of individual liberty and perfect equality when it is remembered that the coloured people whom the whites hold in political subjection and occasionally treat with contempt and even cruelty vastly outnumber them. Love of liberty should include the love of liberty for other people as well as for yourself, To grant freedom voluntarily to subject peoples is an act of chivalry between nations, which is of the rarest occurrence in history. The republicans of Russia in the sudden joy of their freedom resolved to strike off the fetters of the Poles and allowed them to thrash out a constitution for themselves in a convention based on universal suffrage. In British India the people are exhorted by government officials not to worry about their political advance, because the governments in India and in England are thinking of the matter earnestly. It may be said that Polish freedom was a politic measure in time of war. That could not be said of the grant of freedom to the Filipinos by the United States of America. So far from exploiting the poor islands which they had required, the Americans, worshippers though they be of the almighty dollar, spent, it has been said, large sums of their own on educating and elevating the Filipinos. In granting these people a full measure of home rule but of free will and without threat or pressure from outside, the greatest republic of the world has proved itself likewise the noblest

republic. So long as man can appreciate magnanimity and altruism, the people of the United States will be honoured as the most selfless and unsullied champions of international freedom. England, famed in history not without cause as the home of liberty, has yielded the first place in this immortal roll. The republic of Russia has taken the second place. Let England look out before the third place is occupied and bethink herself of her duty to India.

STEP BY STEP

The Filipinos had the whole of their political education in less than 20 years. In a generation Japan replaced her feudal institutions by a Parliamentary form of government. Canada, Australia and South Africa attained responsible government in a few quick steps. The people of India with a civilization going beyond the dawn of history during which they have evolved many forms of government and systems of administration of their own, are told after more than a century of British rule that they are not yet fit to govern themselves. His Honour of the Punjab said that we must wait till we were more educated as a people than we are, till we had laid aside our religious and social animosities and till we had gained greater political experience. Progress in all these three directions is likely to be surer and quicker if we were self-governing than under the present regime. As an abstract proposition, one cannot quarrel with the caution that you must progress 'step by step', that what India wants, to use

the words of H. E. the Viceroy, is not rapid progress but steady progress, that the genius of the British constitution is opposed to catastrophic changes. But why are these venerable and obvious maxims so frequently preached to us? We have won quite a name in the world for slowness, for patience and for 'remarkable tolerance of the existing state of things'. Japan, the self-governing Dominions, the Philippines, all began their upward career after we came under British rule, but they caught us up long ago and have left us behind by a period which, measured in mere years, is considerable, but measured by differences in education, material prosperity, social efficiency and other elements of civilization seems almost an age, and gives cause for disquietude, if not despair.

HOW MANY STEPS? HOW LONG?

Let us take two aspects of progress and see in what time the advice of our bureaucratic friends will take us to the promised land. First, the composition of our Legislative Councils. Constituted in 1853, they worked for eight years before the first Indian found entry into them by nomination. Thirty years passed before the next step was taken, a period within which other peoples found it possible to begin and consummate their political evolution. This step consisted of a slight increase of non-official Indians, some of whom came in by a subsidiary process of election, not recognised in law. Seventeen more years passed before election became a reality and the provincial

legislatures had a majority of non-officials, which has proved a delusion and a snare. What is the next step to be, and when will it be taken? Perhaps we should get an elected majority, in two years more, that is, ten years after the last reform. Of course, this majority would be bare and utterly ineffective. To make it decisive, at least one decade would be necessary. Our mentors would then take us in successive decades through such fractions as two-thirds, three-fourths, four-fifths, till in another half a century we might have a wholly elective legislature in the advanced provinces. Of course a longer period would be required for the Indian Legislative Council and the Councils of the backward provinces to reach this level. Our second test shall be applied to our progress as regards the public service. Here unfortunately many of the steps to be recorded are but policy and pious promise. It was in 1833 that Parliament recognised the absolute equality of Indians with British subjects and the Court of Directors gave the pith of the statute to be that there should be no governing caste in British India. In 1853 some members of Parliament lamented that no effect had been given to this noble policy. In 1858 the policy was solemnly enunciated in the Queen's Proclamation. In 1860 a committee of the Secretary of State's Council recommended simultaneous examinations. Of course the report was shelved. In 1870 another statute made special provision for the entry of qualified Indians into the Civil Service, but no immediate

effect was given to it. In 1877 Lord Lytton on behalf of the Crown solemnly renewed the assurance of equality. In 1879 the first rules were made in a grudging spirit for the admission of Indians to the extent of one-sixth. But this proportion was not actually reached. In 1886 the first Public Services Commission was appointed to examine this question. In 1892 a Provincial Civil Service was constituted, the members of which could be appointed to 93 listed posts belonging to the Indian Civil Service. But the proportion which this number represented has not been worked up to. The next landmark is the appointment of the recent Public Services Commission in 1912. Their recommendation is that Indians should be admitted by means of an examination in India and by nomination to one-fourth of the posts in the Indian Civil Service. The dissenting member, Mr. Justice Abdur Rahim, who is charged with reckless audacity, has recommended that the proportion should be one-third, omitting of course the judicial posts. What actually will be done one cannot say. So here we stand. Eighty-four years after statutory affirmation of our equality we are still looking forward to getting something between a fourth and a third of the chief administrative posts in our own country. And the whole history is marked by noble sentiments and promises, backsliding, bitter recrimination and paltry graceless concession. Can a people who have endured this sort of thing be accused of seeking to introduce catastrophic or revolutionary

changes or effect a 'sudden upheaval' and, a 'startling transfer of political authority' into ignorant and inexperienced hands'?

A NEW WORLD WANTS NEW PRINCIPLES

We cannot afford to stand still or creep along at a snail's or a bureaucrat's pace, when all the world spins round with fresh and bounding energy. No, our friends must shake themselves up and adopt larger units and more generous measures. This is no time for puny programmes, faint-hearted endeavours and grandmotherly precepts. Mr. Lloyd George, whose every speech in these days is replete with stimulus and nourishment for the political reformer, said in vivid and picturesque phrase:

The future of the country depends upon how much politicians have learned. I have heard of politicians who think that when the War is over the same old machinery will be re-established and the same old methods applied. People who don't know politicians think them wild revolutionaries. A wild revolutionary is the most reactionary person in the world. Before the War there were five absolutely independent parties in this country. People are now discovering that none of these had a monopoly of wisdom or was the sole repository of political sagacity, and even the five put together. People are realising that there are more things in heaven and earth than the political philosophy of any of these parties. That is one of the revelations we have seen in the lurid fires of War. When after the War reconstruction begins, I hope, trust and pray that we are not going to dive into pigeon-holes of any party for dust-laden precedents and programmes. Let us think out the best methods for ourselves in the face of the searching facts of which we knew nothing before the War. The experience of generations has been crowded into just a few winters and we should be unworthy of the great destiny to which Providence has called this generation if we threw away all that for the sake of the formulas framed before the flood.

Here is the testimony of a very different sort of man. General Smuts comes from a land not

known to be a congenial soil for generous policies or liberal movements.

Let me give you one word of warning, In thinking of this matter, do not try to think of existing political institutions, which have been evolved in the course of European developments. The British Empire is a much larger and more diverse problem than anything we have seen hitherto, and the sort of constitution we read about in books the sort of political alphabet which has been elaborated in years gone by, does not apply and would not solve the problems of the future. We should not follow precedents but make them. I feel sure that in the coming years when this problem is in process of solution—because it will never be finally and perfectly solved—you will find our political thought will be turned into quite new channels and will not follow what has been anywhere else either in the old world or in the new; because after all we are built on freedom.... No single man outside a lunatic asylum wants to force those young nations into any particular mould.

THE GREAT POLITICAL LESSON

When I read speeches like these, I occasionally wonder what the censor is doing. They may be all right in England, but when you and I and other Congressmen read them here, is not their tendency inflammatory? If I were a bureaucrat of the type of Sir Michael O'Dwyer I would prohibit Mr. Lloyd George from speaking on the Russian Revolution for the next two years. When will these irresponsible orators in Parliament learn to consider the effect of their utterances on the minds of Indian politicians? Here again is Mr. Bonar Law, thrown off his guard in the heat of debate, giving the outside world a glimpse of the secrets of the Cabinet and letting them know of the weakness and temptations of the rulers of men. Could he not have refrained from saying this inconvenient thing at the end of

the debate on India Cotton Duties in the House of Commons?

This was the position in which they were placed. They knew there would be some trouble in Lancashire though they did not anticipate it would be so great. But what they had to decide from the point of view of the War was whether there was likely to be more trouble at home or in India. That was the question, and it was on that basis that they gave their vote. (Mr. Dillon: Where there is most trouble you give in?) That is another way of putting it. (Laughter.) Whatever did give trouble politically was a thing which, if it could be avoided, ought to be avoided.

The strong Indian ruler, according to Lord Sydenham, should avoid even the appearance of yielding to clamour or making a concession for fear of trouble. Such softness as Mr. Bonar Law has confessed, if manifested in India, would lead to straight disaster. That is why the ex-Governor of Bombay adjures the authorities to reject the memorandum of the venturesome "Nineteen" promptly and ignominiously. Else what would they not do next? Happily, we are not mere babes, we know a little of the way public affairs are managed. Legislators and statesmen, however far they may see into the future, cannot act till events ripen and almost force their hands. Often they have to choose the lesser of two evils, for, if challenged, they must be able to say, 'I did it only because I saw that if I did not do it there would be more harm than if I did it.' In my limited experience there has been one clear case in which a leading official said, 'I agree to your suggestion, but before I can adopt it there must be such an expression of public opinion as to make it appear inevitable.' That

is the secret of constitutional political agitation. Our cause has many friends both in England and in India, but they can do very little for it till by our action we can give it such momentum as to make it inevitable.

DUTY ON COTTON IMPORTS

The subject of the enhanced import duty on cotton next claims our attention, not only because of its intrinsic importance to the economic welfare of India, but because it illustrates in a striking manner the shortcomings of our successes and the way in which every hope in human affairs is dogged by fear. In the first place let us be clear as to the precise value of this forward policy on the part of our Government. The 4 per cent. enhancement of cotton duty is primarily for the purpose of increasing the revenue and thereby helping the Government of India to pay off the annual obligations which they have incurred on account of the War gift of £ 100,000,000 made by India to Britain. But as it is not counter-balanced by a similar rise in the excise duties on local cotton manufactures, it acts also as a measure of protection to our cotton industry and has for that reason been welcomed in India as the first breach made in the free trade policy imposed upon us by our political suzerain. The bulk of enlightened Indian opinion has demanded fiscal independence, so that before other things we may protect our feeble industries from the cheap free-trade goods of Britain. It is by such anti-British tariffs that the self-governing

Dominions have built up their manufacturing industries. We wish to be allowed to proceed along the same way to industrial prosperity, but our status as a Dependency of Great Britain has deprived us of the liberty to do so. The War gift that we have willingly made to ease the burden of England's debt entails for a period of thirty years and possibly more a heavy annual liability, which our feeble financial system can bear only with great strain. It is, therefore, more necessary than ever that we should have freedom to husband our resources all we can and increase our productive powers. England, for whose sake primarily our finance is being strained, is under a moral obligation to grant us fiscal autonomy. We have the right to expect that we should be allowed to proceed farther in this direction as our interests may require from time to time. But there is reason to apprehend that we may have to retrace even this step that we have taken, for owing to the opposition of Lancashire representatives the resolution sanctioning the cotton duties was only passed with an addendum proposed by Mr. Asquith that it will be reconsidered along with the whole question of the fiscal relationship of the various parts of the Empire to one another and to the rest of the world. Mr. Bonar Law, in supporting the duties, used the ominous words, "What had been done did not settle the principle for which they had fought so long; it obviously could not settle it, because *no political party here was satisfied with the arrangement*. It was obvious, therefore, that it was

not the final arrangement." To add to our misgivings, a recent cablegram reports a unanimous recommendation of the Imperial War Conference in favour of a system of Imperial Preference. This would mean, if anything, that India's fiscal freedom would be greatly crippled and that she could not fully protect her cotton industry against the ruinous competition of Lancashire and that she might be compelled to sell her produce to England for prices lower than those that she might command outside the Empire. Some years before, when the same question was raised under the name of preferential tariffs, the Government of Lord Curzon proved almost incontestably that India would be placed at a heavy disadvantage under such a system. It is difficult to dogmatise without a full discussion of details, and it is on the whole wise to suspend judgment till we learn the precise character of the proposals. It is the more necessary to suspend judgment because in one of his speeches Sir P. Sinha pleaded for fiscal autonomy on behalf of India and deprecated the sacrifice of our economic interests to those of any industry or section either in Great Britain or elsewhere, and Mr. Chamberlain seemed generally to endorse the contention. Imperial Preference *prima facie* infringes the principle of fiscal autonomy or at any rate impairs its integrity. But till we know everything it is not necessary to be alarmed, as there might be ways in which, while some discrimination was made in favour of other parts of the Empire,

India was still able to find means of adequately protecting both her commercial interests and her young industries.

The debate on the subject in Parliament has many features of interest. The Secretary of State indulged in a personal reminiscence which reflects great honour on his moral courage and sense of justice. The champions of Lancashire did not shine to advantage and received a severe rebuke for the glaring inconsistency of the arguments that they advanced. Their concern for the interests of the poor consumer in India and the sweated factory operative in Bombay was shown up as not altogether altruistic, and Lord Curzon made the striking remark that for forty years Lancashire had been the powerful and almost menacing figure in the background of Indian finance and Indian tariffs. Besides, the unexpected strength of the Opposition elicited the best efforts of the Secretary of State and the Prime Minister, who felt called upon to defend their action with a degree of warmth and breadth of view not always evoked by debates on Indian subjects. The most powerful arguments were based on the necessity of redressing a long-standing grievance and respecting the unanimous sentiment of the Indian people. Such emphasis was placed on these arguments that the Irish Nationalists demanded their application to the question of Home Rule in Ireland and in India.

Lord Curzon said :—It was always the interests of Lancashire which had prevailed against the

interests and sentiments of India. Was it surprising in those circumstances that India should feel resentment, that India should regard this an ancient wrong for the redress of which she had always looked to the consideration and justice of her British rulers?... He asked their lordships to look at the matter from the larger, not the smaller, standpoint. This was not a question of Free Trade or Protection; not a question of Lancashire against Bombay. It was not merely a fiscal or economic question. The idea deeply in his mind was that it was a tardy act of justice to India—a sincere reparation to what he regarded as a nation wronged. Mr. Chamberlain: “When honourable members contend that the Government, when they sanction the imposition of the increased customs duty, are bound to raise the Excise at the same time, I tell them with all solemnity and gravity that they are asking for that which neither this Government nor any Government will do. For you would so affront Indian opinion and your action would be so bitterly and deeply resented that you would not carry with you that general consent of the governed, that general good-will of the people, which is necessary to you under any form of Government—(Mr. Dillon.—Except in Ireland.) and not less necessary when you are dealing with Government so circumstanced as is the British Government in India. I would beg the House to be under no misapprehension as to the widespread character or gravity of the feeling in India on this matter. I can quote passage after passage from, I think, every

Indian member of the Legislative Council....In this matter the course we have hitherto pursued and from which this change relieves us sets us right with Indian opinion. I am told that I am breaking the truce which has lasted for 20 years. That is not the Indian opinion. All that time it has been an open and a running sore. (An Hon. Member.—So has Ireland.) It has offered a ready weapon to every ill-wisher of our rule; it has been the theme of every seditious writer; and it rankles as an injustice and an indignity in the mind of every loyal Indian who cares about these things. (An Hon. Member.—A good Home Rule speech.)...“I appeal to him (Mr. Asquith), acting in the spirit of great imperial patriotism, to cast his vote with the whole weight of his influence into the redress of a grievance which rankles in India now, which separates Indian sentiment from our sentiment, which leaves our Government, rightly or wrongly, under the aspersion that where some English section or influence clashes with the interests and aspirations of the people of India, we are ready to sacrifice India to save our electoral fortunes.”

Mr. Lloyd George: “The first consideration is the interest of the hundreds of millions of people in India for whom we are the guardians and the trustees. (Hear, hear.) By every canon of justice, fair dealing and liberty, their interest ought to be paramount when you come to consider any fiscal matter directly affecting them. Is there any doubt in the mind of anyone who knows anything

about the opinion of the people of India of what they think about these proposals? Without exception all classes, creeds, races, and nationalities have accepted them as a measure of justice. If there were such a thing as a plebiscite possible of the whole of the people of India I have absolutely no doubt how their votes would go upon this question. At this moment we thought as a matter of policy, as a War measure, it was desirable that this great act of justice should be extended to India. And what has been the result? There has been no doubt about it that it has sent a thrill of enthusiasm right through that great Empire. (Cheers.) I have no doubt we shall reap in abundance the harvest of this peace of justice and fair play and equity, which we have extended to the population of India. That is why we choose this particular moment. Here is a grievance which the whole population of India has been feeling, and feeling acutely... My Right Hon. friend in the course of his speech stated very fairly that the first consideration to be given when weighing the equalities of this case must be the interests of the population of India. I should not have thought there was any doubt about that at all. The first consideration is the interests of the hundreds of millions of people in India for whom we are the guardians and the trustees. By every canon of justice, fair dealing and liberty, their interests ought to be paramount when you come to consider any fiscal matter directly affecting them."

LOCAL BODIES TO BE WHOLLY ELECTIVE

A reform in administration for which the time has decidedly come is to make our local bodies, *i. e.*, municipalities, district boards and taluk boards and, where they exist, village committees or panchayats, wholly elective. I know officials think that we generally pay undue attention to the constitution of all bodies, whether they be legislative councils, bodies for local self-government, university senates or special organizations. We do not take, it is said, sufficient interest in the functions and actual work of these bodies. It does not strike us that an indifferent constitution with little or no election may often produce very good results on account of the personnel, while an ideal constitution in the hands of unsuitable persons may lead to inefficiency and even corruption. That is so ; but it by no means follows that the pains taken in framing a constitution are always thrown away. A despot acting singly is often the centre of a wholesome and elevating influence and may confer much good on those who look up to him. Still experience has taught mankind to cultivate a decided preference for republican or democratic forms of government. In mixed organizations of which the personnel cannot always be chosen for character or efficiency, it is necessary to distribute power and responsibility so that the failure of one part need not bring about the ruin of the whole, or the spirit of faction or wanton mischief render peaceful and continued work impossible. The practice of Govern-

ment in this country teaches the lesson of circumspection in devising suitable constitutions for organizations which have the power of seriously influencing the welfare of the community. Government is custodian of vast interests, especially in a country like India, and has always been slow to divest itself of responsibilities, even though the law might not cast these on it. The theory of governmental functions in Western countries has enormously widened their scope, and socialistic principles acting on democratic forms have reconciled people to the interference of Government in every department of national life. But this interference and watchfulness on the part of Government may be exerted in various ways, some of which are open to serious objection. Broadly speaking, these ways fall into two classes—external and internal. External interference is an attribute of sovereignty, and where Government shrinks from exercising it when required the condition of affairs will tend to become anarchical. Internal interference is a more intricate and thorny problem. To put the matter roughly, the greater the self-reliance and public spirit and organizing power of the subjects, the less should be the internal interference of Government organizations for which it is not primarily responsible. Where these qualities have been fairly developed, Government stands to gain in popularity and efficiency in proportion as it withdraws its hand from the ordinary life of the community. It was therefore in the fitness of things that in the universi-

ties, and in bodies charged with the duties of local government, the central power started by providing for a certain measure of internal control. We owe it perhaps to this precaution that our municipal and rural boards, whatever their shortcomings, have been saved from falling into such depths of inefficiency and corruption as we read of in the case of English local bodies in the middle of the nineteenth century. From time to time, however, the constitution of these bodies must be revised so that they may be freed more and more from inside control. As in other matters, our Government has shown no alacrity in relaxing its paternal attitude towards them, and the result to-day is a great deal of dissatisfaction among those who are interested in the growth of local self-government and are anxious that through it the people should be taught, in an ever increasing degree, the art of managing their own affairs.

Internal control is now exerted by Government in two separate ways, first by nominating a certain proportion of the members of these corporations, and secondly, by choosing a man who should preside over their deliberations and bear responsibility for their executive work. The members so appointed and the presidents or executive officers are in some cases officials and in other cases non-officials. From the standpoint of the advanced politician this does not make much difference. With a few exceptions non-officials take their cue from their official colleagues—and for purposes of measuring the re-

lative strength of parties we may class the official and non-official nominees together. And it would not be doing any violence to the actual facts, if in this discussion, which has the political education of the people mainly in view, our classification of members recognizes only the elected and the nominated sections. The nominated non-official is not, however, such an anomaly as the elected official. To this day in certain provinces of India the presidents of local bodies, although chosen by election, are, with rare exceptions, the principal executive officers in the localities. Election which yields such results is a mockery, and as the report of the Decentralization Commission mildly puts it, it would be well, where Government thought it essential, to appoint the officials directly. In Madras till recently we used to hear a great deal of the evils attendant on the candidature of officials at popular elections. Attempts were made frequently in the Legislative Council to induce Government to disqualify officials for such candidature. These attempts have only been partially successful. Government have imposed certain restrictions on the candidature, but have not prohibited it. I understand that a similar state of things exists in this presidency. This, however, is a matter vitally connected with the purity of elections, the independence of the voter and therefore the growth of manly citizenship among the people. The practice of official candidature, once recognized as open to censure, must be definitely abandoned and the law amended accordingly. It is a

pity that Government should exhibit any reluctance to carry out this principle in its integrity, Let us hope it will not be long before our system of local self-government is purged of this mischievous excrescence.

Having mentioned the Governments of Madras and Bombay together in the above connection, I must hasten to say they do not appear in other matters relating to local self-government to stand on the same level. Somehow or other it is the misfortune of the Bombay Presidency, as progressive and enlightened as any in the country, to labour under the disadvantage that from the time Sir James Fergusson adopted an obstructive attitude when Lord Ripon initiated his beneficent policy of 1882, the Government of Bombay have been unable to shake off altogether their excessive 'hesitation and distrust' in the treatment of municipalities and district and local boards. For reasons which an outsider cannot understand and which most of you here do not perhaps understand any more than I, the elective principle is not advanced in Bombay to the same extent as in Bengal or Madras and, stranger still, in some of the other provinces, generally called backward. In fact the extraordinary thing in local self-government in our country, which Government will do well to ponder, is that in some ways it is the backward provinces like Assam and the Central Provinces where the local bodies show the greatest constitutional advance. Will Government say, "Where the people are backward, it does not matter how advanced the constitution is; it is

where, the people are advanced that the greatest caution and hesitancy are required?" I do not suppose that this would be the line of reasoning adopted by Government, for it would be in manifest opposition to the reasoning they adopt in the case of larger political matters where the backwardness of the people is urged as the sole excuse for slow advance. The fact is that your Government, more than other Governments in India, are labouring under the traditional notions engendered in the days when the system was first tried and fail to realise that very large steps in advance may be taken with perfect safety to all the interests involved. The only thing requisite is the firm resolve not to be hurried into measures of interference by the sight of avoidable inefficiency of neglect or the welfare of ratepayers.

After all the ratepayers, who are primarily interested in the maintenance of a proper tone in local self-government, will never learn to exercise control over their representatives till they are convinced that Government will not look after them except in cases of extremity. Nor will the fullest sense of responsibility be evolved in the members of these bodies so long as the Government shows a readiness to save them from the consequences of their mistakes or misdeeds. In so far as the local bodies have powers of raising local taxation and regulating its incidence in individual cases, it is necessary not only to let the voice of the ratepayers be heard through their representatives, but to make them realise fully that the

rates and taxes, both direct and indirect, are imposed on them by their own representatives and spent on their own welfare by executives appointed and controlled by those very representatives. The maxim of popular government, which is the very keystone of the British constitution, *viz.*, no taxation without representation, and extended by the silent implication of law to colonies occupied by British subjects, has not been extended to India. But its full extension is only a question of time. People may be allowed to understand the principle and benefit by it as a beginning in the smaller sphere of local self-government. There is obvious advantage in Government, which is already compelled to assume direct responsibility for large Imperial taxation and much Provincial taxation which is indirect, freeing itself completely from responsibility for local taxation. At present the official representatives in these bodies have the power like other members of initiating and promoting taxation proposals and taking a share in the actual administration of local finance. And it is well-known that the official element in these bodies, except in large centres of education, exercises an influence far in excess of its numerical strength and in several cases is all-powerful.

In Great Britain, the continent of Europe and America the central governments have not found it necessary, for keeping local bodies up to their duties, to appoint any proportion of their members; whether in towns or rural areas, these local authorities are wholly elected. In fact it is not too much to say

that a proposal to make nominations would be keenly resented. The principle is that the administration of local government is a concern of the ratepayers, and only they and no others have the right to choose the men who conduct that administration.

Experience too confirms the *a priori* argument that nominee officials cannot take the same interest in local affairs that representatives of the ratepayers, who are themselves ratepayers, will take. In nearly every province the attendance of officials at meetings of the local bodies compares unfavourably with that of the elected members, and I have personally known many conscientious officials who have told me that their work as members of local bodies was a burdensome addition to their official duty, while not being of much use to the ratepayers. They are birds of passage, so to say, and seldom identify themselves with local interests. Some of them are apt to domineer, and when they interest themselves deeply in local politics, acquire an influence which, apart from its being good or bad, must hinder the growth of the civic spirit in their brethren. On occasions when a local question becomes so important as to attract the attention of the superior officials of the district, the official member is naturally susceptible to influence from head-quarters, and his vote may be cast neither in accordance with his personal inclinations nor in furtherance of local needs.

It is said that the presence of officials adds to the business capacity of the boards and helps to secure

thoroughness and despatch. There is something in this claim, but not enough to outweigh the violation of principle and the other drawbacks described above. Besides, the claim is less true now than it might have been several years ago. Even in small towns it is possible to find a number of non-officials of sufficient enlightenment and business habits to enable local bodies to dispense with official association.

Another ground on which Government nomination to these bodies is defended is the existence of local factions, between whom officials, being in a sense outsiders, are in a position to act as arbitrators. This, however, is scarcely the case in actual experience. A non-official as often as an official can be found with detachment enough to serve this blessed function of the peace-maker. Nor are officials specially immune from the factious spirit, and it has occasionally happened within my knowledge that the officials of a place have formed a group with a more or less defined antipathy to non-officials.

In defence of the appointment of official presidents, chairmen or executive officers, it is urged, in the first place, that as they have to move about in the district they have superior knowledge of local needs and better facilities than non-officials for local inspection. This contention has some force and is entitled to weight in the case of the district boards, but not in the case of taluk boards or municipalities. But even in the former case it is well to risk some inefficiency and make a beginning in the direc-

tion of rescuing boards from the condition into which they have fallen--of being large but somewhat neglected departments of Collectors' offices. Retired officials and educated landlords are becoming more and more available for non-official public life, and perhaps the number of districts is small in which suitable persons may not be found at the headquarter stations both willing and competent to undertake the duties of presidents of district boards.

The fact of the matter is that there is a feeling prevalent among the higher officials of Government, not altogether blameworthy, that in the last resort they are answerable for the proper conduct of municipal and rural board business. It is no wonder that the simplest way of discharging this responsibility appears to them to be also the best, namely, appointing an official whom they can control and trust to 'carry on'. This accounts for the large number of officials engaged in the executive work of local government, whether as chairmen, secretaries or chief officers. This well-meaning theory, however, is obsolete, and the members of Government must shake themselves free from the compunction that they apparently feel in devolving the responsibility for local interests on local authorities. The burden must one day settle on the right shoulders.

Occasionally the preference shown by Government for official presidents leads to quite extraordinary results. I have known the sub-divisional officer of a district who, in addition to this regular duties,

presided over a taluk board and at least two municipalities besides. Was he to blame if the meetings of these bodies had to be arranged between the arrival of a train at each place and the departure of the return train, and he had not much time for the discussion of the subjects on the 'agenda paper of making himself acquainted with the ratepayers? Administration in general will be none the worse if Government had a little less faith in the unlimited capacity of their officials and a little more faith in the capacity of non-officials.

The case for this reform derives its greatest strength from the necessity of training the people of the country to a full measure of self-government in local affairs as a preparation for self-government in national affairs. It is true our local bodies are even in their present condition passable schools of political education; but they will not yield the best lessons of which they are capable until they are made autonomous units. The testimony of history is not uniform in this respect. Canada had no municipal institutions when it was called upon to assume responsible government, and some nations which enjoyed great national prosperity and glory have shown great ineptitude in the management of local affairs. In India, however, the 'step by step' argument is understood in a very literal and sometimes, one might say, in an arithmetical sense. Those who advance it in season and out of season, having it in their power to afford this valuable, though not altogether

indispensable, training must lose no time in placing it within the reach of the communities committed to their care.

It must, however, be recognised that the withdrawal of inside control will necessitate the tightening of outside control from the centre. The powers that Government has under the present law of the different provinces for exercising control are ample; but, if need be, there is no theoretical objection to their being made more stringent. The unsatisfactory condition of American municipalities is justly attributed to the lack of vigorous supervision of the centre, and we know as a matter of history that local government in England which in 1835 was reported upon in very unfavourable terms entered on a career of efficiency and usefulness only after Parliamentary control was firmly established and the central government was given powers to inspect, advise and aid the local bodies. Mr. Sidney Webb says :—

A century of experience has demonstrated that it is undesirable for Local Authorities to be subject to no administrative control whatsoever from a Central Authority, for them to be left without independent inspection or audit, without access to centralised experience and specialist knowledge, without any enforcement of the minimum indispensably required for the commonweal, and without mitigation of the stupendous inequality of local rates that complete autonomy involves.

THE PUBLIC SERVICES QUESTION

The intense disapprobation with which the report of the Public Services Commission has been received by the Indian public throws into strong relief the extraordinary stimulus which the War has given to the ambition and the expectation of our

people. There can be no doubt that, if the report could have appeared before August 1914, it would not have provoked a storm of indignation as it has done; conceivably it might even have caused mild pleasure in the breasts of some critics. There are some things in it which mark a clear advance on the existing position. For one thing there is a distinct recognition that certain services might be wholly Indian and that their salaries might be fixed on an Indian scale. Among these are the scientific services of which the higher grades are recruited in England, because men of the requisite knowledge and training are not available here. To obviate this difficulty the Commission make the sound suggestion that the technical colleges of engineering, agriculture, forestry, etc., should be raised to such a high level of efficiency as to turn out the men required for filling the highest posts in the departments concerned, and the Hon'ble Mr. Chaubal places just emphasis on the recommendation and says that it should be carried out by the Government before other items involving expenditure are taken up. A further recommendation on this branch of the subject is that half the vacancies every year should be announced as open to successful students in Indian colleges. Some advance is recommended in all the services, though it is not the same throughout. In none is it satisfactory; in some, especially the civil, police and medical services it is most disappointing. During the inquiry we heard a lot about the unfitness of Indians for

higher administrative posts, and in the case of the Indian Civil Service much was made of the necessity of maintaining the British spirit of administration. Whether because the Commission do not believe in these things or because they desire to avoid bad blood, they barely refer to such racial comparisons in this report. But they do not get full credit for this forbearance. For to justify the limitations they still wish to maintain on the employment of non-Europeans, they advance the proposition that in the civil and police services it is necessary for political reasons, that is, for the preservation of British interests that the British element must have a decided preponderance. This exclusion of Indians by reason of their race only from the great bulk of the higher positions of trust and responsibility is certainly hard to reconcile with the absolute equality repeatedly promised to the people of the country in respect of any position the duties of which they are fitted faithfully and efficiently to discharge. The Commissioners have no partiality for competitive examinations, and it is with some effort that they make up their mind to retain them wherever they are used now for recruitment. Nomination is not to be haphazard as hitherto; a suitable educational qualification, which need not be the same for all communities alike, is to be required of all nominees, and for selecting the men to be nominated committees are to be set up on which Indians and non-officials should have some representation. Increases of salary and pension,

better terms of leave, higher rates of allowances of all kinds are proposed almost throughout. Some reasons are given for these recommendations, but neither the general poverty of the country, nor the financial straits to which it has been reduced seem to have been kept in mind by the Commissioners. The question of separating executive and judicial functions has not been considered on the ground that the terms of reference seem to exclude it. Simultaneous examinations, on which two generations of Indians have set their hearts as the barest measure of justice to them in the matter of the premier service, have once more been refused. The age limits for those who compete in England have been lowered from 22-24, which is the present age, to 17-19, though it is admitted that this will have the effect of nearly closing the English door to Indian candidates. The principal feature of the report is the institution of a separate examination in India adapted to the teaching in Indian universities for recruitment to the Indian Civil Service of seven officers every year. The examination will not be open as in England, but each university is to nominate twenty candidates, thus giving in all about a hundred competitors. Besides these seven there will be two more recruits every year nominated by the Secretary of State on the advice of the Government of India and called the King Emperor's cadets. All the nine candidates are to be sent to England to be trained during a period of three years along with the successful English candidates at the London examination of

the same year. The courses of study and the examinations are common to all during the period of training, and it is according to the marks obtained at these examinations that the candidates are to be finally ranked. The figure 9 for recruitment in India has been arrived at in this way. To safeguard British interests it is considered that three-fourths of the superior appointments in the Indian Civil Service should be filled by Englishmen. The number of such posts is 755. Indians may thus be appointed to one-fourth of this number, i. e., to 189 posts. Forty of these will be given in the judicial line to members of the bar ; forty-one to selected officers of the Provincial Civil Service, in lieu of the present listed posts ; to get the remaining 108 officers, according to the usual calculations for inferior posts, leave reserve, and training reserve there should be added 102 posts. The annual recruitment for these 210 posts, according to the decremental rate of 4.17, comes to nine. The police department is guarded with even greater jealousy from the admixture of Indians. Only 10 per cent are to be allowed into the Imperial ranks, but this percentage may be eventually increased to twenty, as favourable occasion should arise. The Education Service should be divided into class I and class II. In class I should be included all the members of the present Indian Educational Service and a number amounting to one-third of them taken from the Provincial Educational Service, so that roughly speaking one-fourth of the higher educational posts will come to Indians ; but

when new posts are created in the future, as far as possible, every alternative post should be given to an Indian. Class II should be recruited in India; and from it promotion may be made to class I, though the Commission feel they cannot fix the exact proportion. Besides the officers of class I and class II, there is to be a body of superior educationalists to the number of, say, twenty, who should be freed from the obligation to lecture to B. A. candidates, but should be devoted to research and the training of students who undertake original lines of work. They are to be appointed solely by reason of their eminence in learning and without any reference to race, but whether they are to remain together with their research pupils in a central institution created for the purpose or whether they are to be dispersed amongst the several colleges, whether they are to be Government officers or University professors or professors in the individual colleges, which are to be encouraged to appoint them by liberal salary grants, are questions which the Commission have left to the Government to decide, in the light of notes submitted by individual members.

The brief and inadequate summary is all that I can find room for in my address, and I must now hasten to indicate a few points of general importance which claim attention. One fact necessary for us all to know beyond doubt has emerged clearly from the labours of this Commission. It is not altogether a revelation, for most people had realized that it lay

behind all the discussions as to fitness, efficiency and other superficialities. The Commissioners have advanced in its nakedness the real reason for continuing practically unimpaired the British monopoly of the higher grades of the services. Political necessity is only a euphemism for the rooted desire to secure to Britishers the civil power and a great bulk of the loaves and fishes of office. The old abstractions and idealities about free and open competition and the absolute equality of all British subjects and the extinction of the governing caste in India, which some amiable people on both sides of the controversy have always believed, are now definitely shattered. For the future every revision of the services question will be a frank unredeemed struggle between Europeans on the one hand and statutory Indians on the other. If this is to be the true development, there is no escape from the necessity of fixing from time to time the proportion of posts in the different services to be divided between the parties. It is impossible to ignore the bearing of this question on the struggle for political autonomy which the National Congress and the Muslim League have resolved to bring to a definite issue. Clause 5 of the scheme of post-war reforms under the heading 'IV The Government of India' runs :—"The power of making all appointments in the Imperial Civil Services shall vest in the Government of India as constituted under this scheme, due regard being paid to the existing interests, subject to any laws that may be made by the Imperial Legisla-

tive Council." In the first place, this would eliminate the Secretary of State from all part or lot in this matter of Indian services and transfer the supreme control that he now wields to the Government of India; and as the Government of India would be subject in this behalf to the Indian Legislative Council, the progressive political party in India must look forward to the Indianising of all the services, at least in the eye of the law, as an early consummation. Vested interests would of course have to be scrupulously and generously safeguarded, and expert knowledge and assistance should be obtained to the fullest extent necessary on any terms and from any quarter of the world. The self-governing status has carried with it in the case of each Dominion the power to confine recruitment for all its services within its own borders. I do not wish by any words of mine to embitter a dispute which, dealing with power and prestige, posts and emoluments, is apt in itself to rouse ill-feeling. But it strikes me that, if we are to be true to the self-government programme that we have put forward, it is necessary to combat with all our might the doctrine that there should be a preponderance of the British element in the Civil and Police Services. This doctrine is based unmistakably on suspicion and distrust. The paramountcy of Great Britain would be amply secured by the continuance of all military and foreign affairs in the hands of the Viceroy-in-Council, without interference from the legislature; and on the face of it, it appears.

needless to secure it further by any guaranteed preponderance in the main services. We still hold therefore to our demand of a simultaneous examination for the Civil Service, a common list, no racial proportion, and equal opportunities of advancement for all. Should, however, the Commission's proposal of a separate examination in India for recruitment of a certain proportion be allowed to prevail, I would suggest that the division of the service be half and half. In making this suggestion I wish to be understood not to mean any discourtesy to Mr. Justice Abdur Rahim, whose able and courageous minute of dissent it is impossible to praise adequately. But I cannot resist the feeling that in proposing one-third as the Indian proportion in the Civil Service (*minus* the Judicial Branch) he appears to concede the claim to preponderance of the British element, which is clearly opposed to Royal and Parliamentary declarations. Secondly, we must object as strongly as we can to all the proposals of the Commission which involve, directly or indirectly, an addition to the salaries, allowances and other emoluments of the services. On this point, I know I shall incur the displeasure of my own countrymen employed in the service of Government. But it is impossible to forget the two sovereign considerations: India is an extremely poor and undeveloped country, and the salaries of the higher grades of our services are already pitched too high. Thirdly, we must seek to extend the sphere of competitive examinations, tempered by nominations, to safeguard

the interests of certain communities, as the means of selecting candidates for public employment. Fourthly, the judicial service must be made independent, recruited exclusively from the bar and placed in all respects under the control of the High Courts in the provinces. The separation of executive and judicial functions is so important that we are not likely to lose sight of it.

WAR LOAN

I feel it my duty to commend to the Conference with all earnestness the claim of the Indian War Loan on all individuals and public bodies who have money to spare. We have to remember that, although the revenues of India are pledged to meeting the interest charges and sinking fund on our war gift of a 100 million £, this will go only towards easing the burden of the United Kingdom in future years. It is only that portion of the gift which is raised as the Indian War Loan which helps immediately in the prosecution of the war.

THE DEFENCE FORCE

I also implore you all to spare no efforts in making the Indian Defence Force a signal success. Disabilities and grievances there are. When shall we be without them? The only thing is we must not cease to struggle against them. We stand to lose heavily all round morally and politically if we let this opportunity pass. Let young men realise the cause of India which they yearn passionately to serve requires before all things that they should acquire regular

military training and that they should eagerly embrace the first opportunity, however small and restricted, of getting it. Failure in this would be a terrible blow to the national movement and we should regret it all our lives. Besides, if there be any reality in our appreciation of the tremendous issues involved in the war and the enormous drain that it causes on the man-power of Britain, we must respond readily to the slight demand made on the educated classes by the Government and mark our sense of the departure in the policy of mistrust hitherto followed in military matters.

COMPULSORY EDUCATION

On the great and absorbing topic of education I do not know how to be brief. But this I will say—that I welcome with the liveliest pleasure the announcement made the other day by Sir Michael O'Dwyer that his Government would entertain proposals coming from municipalities and local boards for making elementary education compulsory, provided they had the support of public opinion and were willing to bear the responsibility of working the compulsory system. I fervently trust that the announcement was made with the sanction of the Government of India, whose attitude of *non possumus* has hitherto discouraged other Governments from lending any countenance to the attempts made by our representatives in local legislatures in this direction. In this presidency the popular movement sustained a repulse from the Government a few months ago. But

the glad news from the Punjab will put heart into the champions of popular education, and I feel sure that my redoubtable friend, the Hon. Mr. Patel, will renew his attack, and I should not wonder if the Government of Bombay made terms with him with a view to eventual surrender. I trust that H. E. Lord Willingdon will leave behind him a memorial in the form of a small Act in favour of compulsory attendance of children of this presidency before he leaves office next year. It is possible, however, that I am rejoicing too soon and I would, therefore, appeal to the leaders and local bodies of this presidency not to relax their efforts in the least.

TWO LOCAL QUESTIONS

Of the many topics of local interest which will find place on our programme I have been advised to refer to two and propose to offer a few remarks on them. The grouping of the Konkan districts of Ratnagiri, Kolaba and Thana with the Southern and Northern Divisions is a grievance of very long standing. This arrangement has operated to the very serious disadvantage of the districts concerned in the matter of representation on the local Legislative Council. The late Mr. Daji Abaji Khare, who represented the Southern Division, urged long ago upon the attention of Government the necessity of either creating a new division for these districts or of joining them on to the Central Division. The people in Ratnagiri, Kolaba and Thana districts speak Marathi, the language of the

Central Division, and they have nothing in common with the Southern or the Northern Division, where Canarese and Gujarati are spoken. Geographically, too, the districts should belong to the Central and not to the Southern or the Northern Division. It may be urged that, as we are now demanding substantial representation for each district on the Council, the question of giving separate and independent representation to these districts is rather out of date. But it is unfair that, in the interval that will elapse before the larger question will be settled, the people of these districts should go without any real representation; and the grievance can be redressed by an executive order without having recourse to legislation on the matter. In regard to general administration too the arrangement at present in force has entailed serious inconvenience. People from Kolaba and Thana would much prefer having the head-quarters of the highest revenue officer at Poona too having it either at distant Belgaum or Ahmedabad. If the posts of Divisional Commissioners are abolished and the district is brought into direct and living contact with the central Government of the province, this grievance will disappear. But I think it is fair to ask that the Government should give practical effect to either of these alternatives without further delay.

I would also like to refer, though with some amount of diffidence, to the question of the *modi* script, which Government have now formally abolished as far as the official records are concerned.

Being personally unacquainted with *modi*, I am at a certain disadvantage in speaking on this subject, though it is hardly necessary to know *modi* in order to understand the merits of the question. A slight effort of the imagination would enable any one to realise the difficulties of the situation. To none should this be easier than to the members of the Indian Civil Service, at whose instance and in whose interest this change has been effected. If they were asked to take down notes of depositions, issue their orders and write their judgments not in the script hand in common use, but in the Roman characters of the printed book, we can well imagine what an outcry would be made, and justly made, against the proposal. But it is this very thing that they are forcing upon their subordinates and clerks. It has been urged in support of this innovation that it makes the reading of manuscripts easier to the European members of Indian Civil Service. I understand, however, from reliable sources that the *balbodh* hand that has replaced *modi* in official records is even more illegible and makes the reading of manuscripts more difficult. Even if this were not so, and *balbodh* had made the work of the civilian a little easier, would that be a valid ground forcing *balbodh*, on thousands of applicants and other persons who have to do with Government offices? It is unfair to the people that this burden should be placed on them in order to give possible relief to a handful of high officials.

The C. I. D.

[Speaking on the Resolution re "Sedition Committee's Report and Working of the Criminal Investigation Department" in the September session of the Imperial Legislative Council in 1918, Mr. Srinivasa Sastri after asking the Government to shelve the Report for the time being, spoke with warmth on the menace of the C.I.D. in India. He narrated his own experiences at the hands of the C.I.D., and drew the attention of the authorities to the operations of this sinister branch of the Police force in India:—]

I am one of those who believe in the great work of the Criminal Intelligence Department. I fully endorse every word of the eloquent testimony borne to it by the Hon'ble Sir William Vincent and the Hon'ble Sir Verney Lovett. But there is a side of their operations to which perhaps the proper attention of the authorities has not been called. It is the way in which a certain section of them, probably the Intelligence Department, dog the foot-steps of and shadow those persons whom they suspect. There is a list, I am told, which I have never seen and probably am never destined to see, the entrance to which is like a valve, opening only inwards. The authorities take your names down readily enough in that list, but I am told it is exceedingly difficult to get out of that list. Your Excellency, I am one of those who

have been subjected for a considerable time to the prosecution of this branch of the service, and if I speak to-day it is to unfold a plain unvarnished tale of the sufferings that I have borne at the hands of this service. Their activities are manifold. Your Excellency would find difficult to believe that two men were always following me for a certain period, for two or three years; they sat outside my house when I was in, and the moment I got out they got out also; when I engaged a *jutka* (in the Madras Presidency we call the lowest class of conveyance by the name of *jutkas*), they invariably found out where I was going by inquiry, and they engaged another *jutka* and came with me. The astonishing thing is that, if they did not find a *jutka* fast enough, they found some means of telling my driver not to go so fast. Once in the town of Coimbatore, when I had important engagements to fulfil and was in the act of engaging a conveyance, these persecutors of mine, unwilling perhaps to forego their afternoon siesta, told every one of them not to drive me. The result was that my engagements had to remain unfulfilled. My Lord, there are other ways in which one has been made to feel that one is a suspect in one's own country for doing nothing worse than loving it. Once I remember being handed over by the railway police to the ordinary police. A humorous experience will, perhaps, interest this Council. We are handed over like chattel. A man came and pointed me out to the ordinary police to take charge; unfortunately I then

happened to be mixed up with a number of people who were more innocent, so to say, than I was. The ordinary police mistook one of my friends for me, with the result that his house and compound were for a whole week haunted by the two people who were after me. I thought I had a permanent release, but my friend told me afterwards that he had complained to the head of the police, with the result that they came back to their proper victim afterwards. But there is another funny thing about these people. Not many days ago, in this very town of Simla, where I stay, a friend of mine, a member of the Bar, chanced to come to me as my guest. Within half an hour of his arrival came a person whom I mistook to be a beggar, for he took out a note-book and was turning over its pages. I thought he was a beggar and would ask me to read some testimonials. He stood at the gateway and had a suspicious leer which ought to have put me on my guard, but being during the last few years free from espionage, it did not strike me immediately how the land lay. In a minute the man came into my room, opened his book and presented it to my guest asking him to sign his name and address at a particular spot. My guest naturally resented it and asked him 'who are you to ask me to sign?' He said 'Police, Sir.' My friend refused. 'What business have you to come here and ask my friend to sign?' I asked. 'If you do not sign,' he replied 'I can get an order.' 'Very well', I told him, "go and get the order.' He went but has not yet returned, which

shows, that there is really some intelligence in the Intelligence Department.

“ My Lord, I wish to ask, how many of my Hon'ble friends on the official benches would have borne a thing of this kind ? I am perfectly certain if it happened to either of the Hon'ble Members who have spoken, they would go to the Secretariat and indulge in language unbecoming the dignity of members of this Council.

“ My Lord, what was my offence that I had to undergo these strange experiences ? I had given up my professional job and joined the Society founded by Mr. Gokhale, whose bust, subscribed for by many of our official friends, your Excellency unveiled the other day. He himself was not free from the attentions of this body of people, but I leave that alone. They are always not sure of the names of their victims. Once I remember Mr. Gokhale himself relating to a predecessor of this Council how they gave trouble to Sir Vithaldas Damodardas Thackersey, for the reason that his name had a *Das* in it that was suspected to have a Bengali sound. I myself happened often to be confounded with a gentleman in my province who bears my name, and with whom, for various reasons, I do not much like to be confounded. Your Excellency, I remember reading in the life of Mazzini that the Austrian Criminal Investigation Department followed him in his younger days in the same way, and the reason they gave was, ‘ We know nothing against this young

man, but he goes about of mornings and evenings in a contemplative sort of mood. Our Government does not want young men to develop a contemplative mood.' I am afraid some members of the Criminal Intelligence Department have taken it into their heads that they do not want any men to give up their professional jobs and take to doing public duties in the missionary spirit. If a man is inclined to do that and wishes for ease and peace, I should advise him to go to Sir Charles Cleveland first and tell him of his intentions and ask him 'what precisely, Sir, are the ways of patriotism that you would tolerate? What are the activities which a man, minded like me to devote himself to the service of the country, would be allowed to pursue?' If he asks these questions and then sets about his business, he will at least enjoy peace and ease. Now that is an experience which is common to many men in this country. I have heard it said, your Excellency, that no man among us, not even the highest, is free from the attention of these officers. If you would ask redress from a higher authority, as I know you would at once ask us to do, I know very well what the result would be, for many have told me from personal experience that if there is an authority higher than the Criminal Intelligence Department, it is not on this earth. I should be told that my petition had been received and would receive attention, and if on a convenient date after giving notice I put a question in this Council, I have no doubt the Hon'ble the Home Member will read a printed answer

in his blandest manner—'The Government have no wish to make further inquiries into this matter.' Now that is, as I said, a state of things which I would request the Government of India, if they can, to look into. I think the head of the Central Intelligence Department ought to have some method of sparing those people who lead honourable and high-aimed lives. Your Excellency, I make these remarks, as I said, with no intention to disparage the very useful work done by this Department, but a branch of its work requires very careful examination and considerable overhauling. It is because I strongly feel, as a former Chief Secretary to the Madras Government once told me when I complained to him, that even if a man is not inclined to be seditious at first, six months' attention from the Central Intelligence Department might convert him into a seditionist, it is because I feel that their methods have caused great humiliation to many young men of fine sensibilities in Bengal and elsewhere, it is because I feel, your Excellency, that in this way disloyalty may be hardened and sedition may even be created where it does not exist, it is because I feel these things that I wish to draw the attention of the Government, the earnest attention of the Government, to look after the ways in certain directions of the Central Intelligence Department, and I propose, as I said in the beginning, if the second part of the Hon'ble Member's Resolution be put to the Councils as an independent proposition, to vote for it."

Delhi Congress Speech

[The following is the full text of the speech delivered by Mr. Srinivasa Sastri at the Delhi Session of the Congress in 1918, in moving an amendment to the Reforms Resolution proposed by Mr. B. Chakravarti :—]

THE Hon. Mr. Srinivasa Sastri, who was received with greetings, said: I take your kindly welcome to mean that you give me a reminder, if I needed one, that on the Congress platform all shades of political opinion are free to find expression, and that any one who has the welfare of India at heart is sure of that welcome on this platform, so that he may deliver himself of such sentiments as he may entertain. That thought is encouraging to me, and I, therefore, bespeak your indulgence, while I lay before you a few matters out of several that I may but do not for want of time take up while I lay before you some matters which may, I fear, be distasteful to the majority of those whom I have the honor of addressing.

I move an amendment in these words. In the resolution before you drop all the words in the clause (d) beginning with "subject to this" and substitute the words "excepting the clause pronouncing the scheme to be disappointing and unsatisfactory and

the clause fixing the period of fifteen years for the completion of Responsible Government for India as a whole." The clause I wish to drop is new. It has been introduced in supercession of another resolution passed at the Special Session of the Congress in Bombay fixing a period of six years for the completion of Provincial Autonomy. The class of people, whom I represent, would have objected even to the clause as it stood. This clause takes us much further and our objections, therefore, are redoubted. It takes us, in my opinion, very far into the dangerous waters. (Cries of "No, no.") I know a good many among you do not think so, but I know also that there are several, even amongst those for whom I am not speaking now, who will probably put the point of view before you that the change is not altogether for the better. That point of view may or may not be right. That point of view you will be glad to hear from others. I am, however, for the moment taking you to another aspect. The Hon. Mr. Patel has already referred to my amendment, although perhaps unconsciously and obtained your verdict against it in advance. I object to the clause in the Bombay resolution describing the Reform Scheme as "disappointing and unsatisfactory." I know I am giving expression to an opinion which you do not relish, but I am here to represent a certain school of thought. I would beg you not to add to my difficulty by interruptions. (Cries of "No, don't hear you.") I am not going to take advantage of your indulgence, but

I will put my case as briefly as I can and leave the rest in your hands. In my opinion and in the opinion of those for whom for the moment I speak, the scheme is in many ways inadequate. (Hear, hear.) I will briefly indicate to you the special difficulty under which I lie. You are aware that the Moderate Conference has passed a number of resolutions on this subject, and as the Hon. Mr. Patel has told you, they and the Special Congress in Bombay are in agreement as regards many very important points. I conceive it a very great advantage that I am enabled to be here and to emphasise the points of agreement as well as to emphasise the points of disagreement. For the moment I am one of those who think that, while the Scheme is defective in many ways and susceptible of improvement, it still marks a substantial step in advance towards Responsible Government. (Cries of "No, no.") As regards the fixing of the time-limit, some speakers said that the Hon. Messrs. Banerji and Chintamani once expressed themselves in favor of statutory time-limit. I dare say they did. I am not here exactly defending them, but I may draw your attention to the fact that that position has been abandoned by them and by others who thought with them for this reason, namely, that the Scheme of Reforms proposed the appointment of Parliamentary Commissions for the determination of the future stages in Responsible Government. Accepting that proposal whole-heartedly, they felt that it would be no longer consistent to advocate the fixing of a time-

limit which really would render the appointment of Commissions idle and futile. That, it seems to me, is an important reason why they have given up their former position. But I also take leave to mention, on my own account, another difficulty that may be felt against this particular item, namely, fixing the statutory time-limit. We have got to see that this time-limit is to be fixed by Parliament. We take leave to doubt whether there is anybody who can persuade the Parliament to guarantee that, at the end of a certain period, whatever may happen in the interval, irrespective of any untoward circumstances in the political atmosphere that may take place, such and such a forward step shall be and ought to be taken. We take it that it would be an impossible position to take and that is why, notwithstanding, we realise the deep disappointment of the past, notwithstanding we remember how often the pledges given have been unredeemed, we realise that it may be difficult to get the Parliament to fix the time-limit absolutely in their hands and in the hands of their successors and that is why I take it, personally, I would not advocate the fixing of a statutory time-limit. That does not prevent us from advocating that, as soon as may be convenient, Responsible Government that we begin ought to be completed. There are other ways in which we could approach Parliament, besides asking that they should guarantee that at the end of the fifteen or twenty years they or their successors should guarantee its completion.

Having taken so much of your time merely to indicate to you the points of difference, let me thank you for the way in which you have been good enough to allow me to speak. I am glad that I have come to the Congress platform. (Cheers.) Not merely because I always intended to do so, that is a fact you all know; not merely because that I wish my voice raised here, however feeble it may be, on behalf of the opinion that the Moderates hold in this country, but also because, I think, it is a great advantage that I should, in unison with the rest of you here, raise my voice and demand that in the Central Government Responsible Government should begin, that the President and the Vice-President of our Legislative Assembly and Council should be elected by those bodies themselves and not merely appointed, and that we should also demand fiscal autonomy for the Provinces, and I am in entire agreement with the Hon. Mr. Patel, although he seemed to think that we should differ, that without fiscal autonomy no reforms that will be inaugurated will be of much value and that Responsible Government that may be inaugurated would be like the dummy figures you see here, soldiers that are gay and imposing to look at, but have no vitality in them.

The Rowlatt Bill

The following is the text of the Hon. Mr. Srinivasa Sastri's speech in opposing the Criminal Law Emergency Powers Bill in the Imperial Legislative Council on Friday, Feb. 7, 1919. The speech made a profound impression at the time. At the conclusion of the speech there was an outburst of applause in which the European members and even some officials joined.

My lord, when some months ago this Council debated the resolution moved by the Hon. Mr. Khaparde on the Rowlatt Committee's Report I refused to support that part of his resolution upon the ground that I did not regard the Report as fiction but as startling revelation of facts. Of course, I said that, while it might lead to some legislative action there was time enough to consider the action when it actually came before the Council. The time has now come. The Government have actually made proposals and we are invited to consider them. I am unable to find that either the nature of or the time for the legislation is suitable. As to the nature of the legislation, laymen like me will not be on sure ground in stating the reasons in a technical way. But as to the time for the legislation, I am perfectly clear that the Government have chosen a very unfortunate time. In the first place, your Excellency, I think it is not in accord-

ance with the practice of other Governments to bring in repressive legislation of this nature long before its necessity has become clear. I was listening with the greatest respect to what the Hon. the Home Member said on this aspect of the subject, and I beg leave to say that he rather overstated his case when he told the Council that the Government must not be left naked and defenceless when the burglar had made his appearance. The Government cannot be

NAKED AND DEFENCELESS.

It is avowedly in full possession of the powers that it needs to put down wrong of every kind. That will continue for many months yet, and if it pleases the Viceroy, for another long year yet it will remain in possession of all the necessary powers. To say that the necessity has now come and that the members of this Legislative Council should not leave the Government in a position of defencelessness, is certainly, in my opinion, to overstate the case. Then the Hon. the Home Member also relied on the recommendations of the Rowlatt Committee but I am unable to find in the recommendations of the Rowlatt Committee any mandate or any strong counsel to the effect that any of the measures proposed must be permanent, that they must be worked into the Penal Code or into the Criminal Procedure Code. Their character as emergency legislation, must be recognized. I think the course taken by the Government in recommending to this Council permanent legislation involving alterations in the Penal Code and the

Criminal Procedure Code goes beyond the recommendations of the Rowlatt Committee and has necessarily, therefore, evoked a great deal of alarm. I conceive, your Excellency, that it was hardly necessary to frighten the country by saying that the Government must be armed with powers of a permanent character. I very much wish, indeed, that the Government had found it possible in the first instance, before

RAISING A STORM

to say that they would be content with these powers being placed in their hands for a temporary period. When in the course of time, the Defence of India Act expired, it was still necessary to have these powers, it was open to Government to call a special session of the Legislative Council, and I do not think that when the Government takes such a startling step as to call a special session of the Council to equip it with the necessary power to meet with a dangerous seditious conspiracy, anyone in the country will raise his voice against it. Now, everything seems to be bright. Wrong-doing is under full control and Government can say that, in the exercise of powers they have, they have secured peace and tranquillity. To say now, long before the necessity may arise, that we want to equip ourselves permanently with weapons of repression—that word has been used by Government members themselves and I have no scruple, therefore, to use it—is, in my opinion simply to set the country in an unnecessary state of excitement.

Then we are told that after all, these powers are not placed in the hands of small officials. The small officials come in only after the Viceroy has satisfied himself that in certain areas in the country crime of a very deep rooted and widespread nature is prevalent or is likely to become prevalent. Now, I take leave respectfully to dissent from the implications of this proposition. The implications of this proposition go very deep indeed. We are asked to supplant the experience of

CIVILIZED GOVERNMENT.

If every word that the Hon. Sir George Lowndes told us were to have its due weight, if what he said were to be carried to its logical conclusion, if in every case where the executive were armed with arbitrary powers, they used them only justly, properly and no more than was adequate to the occasion, if in every case of misexercise they could be brought to book, if there was provision for publicity, then, indeed there is apparently no reason why, in the permanent law of France and in the permanent law of America, there should not be legislation similar to that which is proposed for this country. After all, it is good to have these powers. The executive, wherever they have the power, always use it only when it is necessary. If that is so, if there is no fallibility in the executive, if all high officials, charged with responsible power, never erred, then there is no limit to the placing of arbitrary power in the hands of any executive which a legislative council may be called upon to sanction.

That, however, is not the way in which responsible people look at things. They ask ; 'Are these powers necessary?' I was wondering how the Hon. Sir George Lowndes himself, having made these rather sweeping statements, came later on to say : 'I myself, as a Britisher, hate this kind of thing : repression is distasteful to me.' I heard the Hon. Sir William Vincent also saying, 'After all, these things are bad.' Why should they be bad? We are bidden always to trust the executive to believe that they will never do wrong, that the law will be always used considerately and only in the interests of the poor and the helpless. Why should it be wrong then? Why then should we scruple at all to leave all power in the hands of the executive to

ROLL UP OUR COURTS

of law, to suspend or lay low your legislative councils altogether? That is not the way that we should look at things. We think that the executive are apt to make mistakes, and I think they do make mistakes. We know, sir, that Viceroys, who have held, who are holding and who will hold power, are under no delusion that the Local Governments can make no mistakes. Whatever that be, heads of Local Governments may not yield to the public opinion of their community, may not be hounded on by an infuriated press, may take in hand a policy of severity, always no doubt with the best of intentions, always no doubt with a feeling of horror and repugnance, always no doubt with a desire to stop everything the moment

it should become unnecessary. But we know, sir, from bitter experience that these measures are put into force sooner than they become necessary, that while they are in force they are exercised more harshly than is necessary and that they are dropped only with the utmost reluctance long after the exigencies that called them into existence have disappeared, long after the enormous miseries and frightful hardships have been inflicted. We know that these things have happened, and it is because I take it every Englishman feels that these things may happen that he is obliged to say, when he stands up in defence of a legislation of this kind, however strongly he may word it in one part of his speech: 'I certainly dislike these things, they are objectionable on principle.' If they are objectionable on principle in one place, they are objectionable on principle in every place, and their application must be tested by the severest tests, and they must, at every step

BE OPEN TO CHALLENGE.

In England, my lord, as I have read these things, whenever a repressive law is in exercise, every single exercise of it is at once openly challenged. A public enquiry is probably held. Anyhow, a committee is appointed to take evidence. What happens in India? A press law is passed. Ten years afterwards in the Supreme Legislative Council an enquiry, to be conducted by a mixed commission appointed by the Council, is asked for, and your Excellency's Government come forward and say 'We will not appoint a

committee, we will not face an enquiry into this affair.' Now, that kind of thing is not a circumstance which encourages us to go forward and place summary powers in the hands of the executive, because we fear, with some experience behind us, that you will not submit your actions to the scrutiny of the public as every exercise of arbitrary power should be submitted.

Then, we are told with almost pathetic simplicity quite worthy of a parental Government: 'Why need the innocent fear? The honest man need not walk in fear of these repressive measures. They are meant only to punish the wicked and they will be used only to punish the wicked. Let the virtuous go about as usual in the exercise of their work.' I wish that this idyllic picture were true in India or anywhere. Now, my lord, a bad law once passed is not always used against the bad. In times of panic to which all alien Governments are unfortunately far too liable, in times of panic, caused it may be by very slight incidents, I have known

GOVERNMENTS LOSE THEIR HEADS,
I have known a reign of terror being brought about, I have known the best, the noblest, Indians, the highest characters amongst us, brought under suspicion standing in hourly dread of the visitations of the C.I.D. I remember in my own time—it is not a very long experience I have of these matters—but I can remember a very valued friend of mine, now alas no more, a saint amongst men, telling me with

almost tears in his eyes: 'I have borne a good character all along, but I have recently become a suspect of the C. I. D. and my life is passed in bitterness and sorrow.' Why? Because Government started a policy of suspicion generally in the locality and when they sent their minions of the C.I.D. none, not even the most trusted friends of Government, were safe. I can remember, my lord, in the year 1908 when I went round organizing District Congress Committees, such a blight had fallen on the political world, the C.I.D. had been so active, the repressive policy of Government had been so manifest, that it was impossible in many places to get people to come together to a public meeting. 'Oh, no, not now, not now,' they said. A gentleman, high in office at that time and about to retire from service, met me in the middle of the night on one occasion. I was quite surprised and he told me: 'My dear fellow, I have been longing to see you these three or four days that you have been here, but this place swarms with spies and police informers. I am nearing my pension and have many children. I do not wish to be mixed up with a member of the Servants of India Society to their knowledge.' It is all very well to say that the innocent are safe. I tell you, my lord, when Government undertakes a repressive policy

THE INNOCENT ARE NOT SAFE.

Men like me would not be considered innocent. The innocent man then is he who forswears politics, who takes no part in the public movements of the

times, who retires into his house, mumbles his prayers, pays his taxes and *salam*s all the Government officials all round. The man who interferes in politics, the man who goes about collecting money for any public purpose, the man who addresses a public meeting, then becomes a suspect. I am always on the borderland and, therefore, for personal reasons, if for nothing else, undertake to say that the possession in the hands of the executive of powers of this drastic nature will not hurt only the wicked. It will hurt the good as well as the bad, and there will be such a lowering of public spirit, there will be such a lowering of the political tone in the country that all your talk of responsible government will be mere mockery. You may enlarge your Councils, you may devise wide electorates, but the men that will then fill your Councils will be toadies, timid men; and the bureaucracy armed with these repressive powers will reign unchecked under the appearance of a democratic government. Well, we are all anxious to punish the wicked, none of us desires that wickedness should go unpunished, but at the same time I think it is one of the fundamental principles of criminal jurisprudence, in fact, one of the very foundations of a stable society, that even the wicked must be punished in certain ways. When Skiffington was shot, I remember the whole world was shocked. Roger Casement had an open trial. But, if Roger Casement, a wicked man as he was, a criminal as he was, and thought so by all reasonable people, had been

shot as Skiffington was shot, I beg leave to say the world would have been shocked. Even Roger Casement had his rights. He must be tried in open court and he must be allowed an opportunity of clearing his character. Now, even in war, when all humanity throbs with excitement and peril, and when nobody thinks of anything except how to conquer the enemy, even then, sir, there are the laws of war: you have got to play the game. The Germans have been condemned for nothing so much as for the callous way in which they treated all laws of war. I am sorry to think that in some cases England has had

TO FOLLOW GERMANY,
very reluctantly indeed, but any way. There are laws not unknown to ancient chivalry illustrated by the life of Bhishma, laws which even in war may not be violated without incurring the serious reprobation of history. When there are criminals abroad in a country there are certain ways in which they ought to be brought to book. You ought not to lay them by heels and punish them in ways that will shock the sense of justice, in ways that will make the innocent feel that there is no law in the land, in ways that will make honest, virtuous and public-spirited work impossible. The price, even for the extinction of wickedness that is demanded then is far too high. Much better,—it seems an ungracious thing to say,—much better that a few rascals should walk abroad than that the honest man should be obliged, for fear

of the law of the land to remain shut up in the house, to refrain from the activities which it is his nature to indulge in, to abstain from all political and public work merely because there is a dreadful law in the land. I was astonished to hear Sir Verney Lovett tell us that it is not enough to indulge in conventional regrets in this Council. I wonder very much whether he will agree to retain and repeat the word 'conventional.' When honourable members here get up and reprove wicked deeds I take leave to say that they do not do it in a merely 'conventional' manner. I take it that we all abhor wickedness as much as Sir Verney Lovett or any other member of the Rowlatt Committee. May I turn back and say that the proposals made by the Government betray a somewhat

CALLOUS DISREGARD OF LIBERTY.

I will take back the word "callous" the moment anybody says that it is too harsh, and I take it that the Hon. Sir Verney Lovett will take back his 'conventional.'

*The Hon. Sir Verney Lovett :—*May I explain, my lord? What I meant by conventional was simply this. I meant that expressions of regret for calamities and for tragic occurrences, which are not followed by serious attempts to secure that such calamities and such tragic occurrences shall not happen again, seem to be worth nothing more than conventional regrets.

*Mr. Sastri, continuing, said :—*Then my lord, the Hon. Sir William Vincent told us that those laws are intended only to purify politics, not to sup-

press, but to purify politics. I have taken down his very words: 'not the suppression but the purification of politics is our object,' he said. If in this world good intentions always bore fruit, it would be very well and this would be a splendid world to live in. The history of legislation, both social and political is strewn with instances of miscarriages of excellent intentions. Laws intended to cure poverty have aggravated it, multiplied it, laws intended to suppress crime may run very well in the same unhappy direction and I take leave to say to the Hon. Sir William Vincent that the laws now placed before us, which are aimed at purifying politics may come dangerously near suppressing it. You cannot place on the statute book such drastic legislation without putting into the hands of over-enthusiastic executive officers what I consider

SHORT CUTS X

to administrative peace. As I said before even, peace in administration, valuable as it is, can be sought in wrong ways. You provide them with short cuts to administrative peace, and there is no administration that is able to resist the temptation to run across these short cuts when the only royal road to peace is the right road and the righteous road. Now, anarchists, it is said, do not want reform. They spurn these political concessions. Oh yes, there are two ways in which this expression is intended to be understood. It means, in the first place, that the crime which we are out to deal with in the Punjab, Bengal and elsewhere,

is partly only political and partly it has become ordinary. I much regret that, so far as I am able to judge on this matter that has been placed before us, there is very considerable force in the observation. I do think my lord that however this unfortunate episode has begun, though it may have begun in pure political methods, a part of it perhaps has now passed into what must be described as chronic crime. That is so, but I still think that a good part of it is political, and for political crime, while such repulsive laws as may be necessary ought to be put in force, the principal remedy is political amelioration. But perhaps there is another sense, in which this has got to be understood. The anarchist does not want political reform. That is but too true, but why? That is the thing which we have got to understand. The anarchist is afraid that the friction that he wants in the land, that excitement in which he wishes people continually to live, will die down if the Government became conformable more and more to the democratic way. If responsible government is granted, if ameliorative measures of one kind or another are passed, it is possible that the people will be quiet for a time and the anarchist will not find plenty of room for his work. He wants that in this country,

DISSATISFACTION AND DISCONTENT

should assume more and more aggravated forms. Quite so, but what is the reason for this abnormal state of things? The anarchist is a morbid creature.

The revolutionary, the bomb-thrower even where their motives are honest, that is to say, even where their motives are unselfish, are blind. In my opinion, they dwell too much upon the unfavourable aspect of things. They read contemporary affairs wrong, they read history wrong, they see no righteousness anywhere. My lord, political remedies do not satisfy them and because they want the final remedy of destruction, all these things seem wrong to them. But because the anarchist is in this unfortunate condition of mental derangement, are we to say, ' Since these people are not going to be satisfied by political concessions, we will not think of them, will only apply the rule of law to them ' ? That is not the way, I think, that sound statemanship should go about the business. We should offer them satisfying methods of political emancipation. But, after all, it is not these anarchists that have to be satisfied : it is the general atmosphere which feeds anarchy that we have got to cure and when the anarchist finds that he gets no sympathy anywhere that he cannot propagate any wicked doctrines into the soil where there is contentment and political prosperity, he will naturally die, even if the long arm of the law does not get at him. There is one thing that I should like to say before I sit down. The Hon. Sir Verney Lovett quoted to us, on more than one occasion, the words of Mr. Gokhale. Now, it is very easy for me to quote Mr. Gokhale back again for the edification of Sir Verney Lovett and the other members of the Council. We can all

quote passages at each other. We can unearth classical quotations, we can ransack Greek, Latin and Sanskrit for passages of great pith and moment and applicability to the present conditions, but what we have got to see is how far we are prepared to act upon the one side and upon the other up to the spirit of the teachings for which we are all striving. The Hon. Sir William Vincent said that we are now

UNDERGOING A TEST.

Oh yes—

Sir William Vincent.—May I correct the honourable member? What I said was that their attitude on this bill would be regarded by many as a test both in this country and outside it. I sent for my remarks of yesterday, to be quite certain as to what I had said,

Mr. Sastri—Yes, it will be so regarded by a few people.

Sir William Vincent.—By many.

Mr. Sastri.—Not necessarily by the Hon. Sir William Vincent.

Sir W. Vincent.—Not necessarily.

Mr. Sastri continuing, said : As a test of our capacity to stand any measure of responsible government, are the members of this Council going to face the unpopularity, the odium of passing a repressive measure which has become necessary? That was the question asked. Now, my lord, I am no member of the Indian Civil Service. I have not been schooled in the stern discipline of that service. I am, perhaps,

too tender by nature. It may be that I and several others like me may be unable to face the storm of unpopularity, but I should like to say, and I am not ashamed of it, that we certainly do not think that the sign of strength, that the sure proof that you are a born administrator, consists in courting unpopularity and defying public opinion. I am not made that way, I do not think I lose by that, but at the same time, when the stern call of duty comes, when the requirement of truth is laid on me, when the best interests of my country, as I understand them, demand it, I am perfectly prepared to submit to unpopularity; if necessary, I am prepared to go through the fire of public odium but it has got to be proved to me that it is necessary. I will not, for the mere wantonness of it, for the mere fun of it, merely to demonstrate that I am fit to be in charge of a district or even of a division, court unpopularity for these reasons. Now, we have been subjected to many tests, we have given our consent to many repressive laws by now, the Press Act, the Defence of India Act. During the War we were hourly on our trial. We have given 100 millions. We have given this, we have given that; the other day we were told that the gift of 45 millions would also be a matter of test. We submitted to it. What tests have been really applied to us to which we have not cheerfully submitted I can hardly think of.—One bidden to bring the milk of a beast of prey? We have brought a jugful of the

MILK OF THE TIGRESS.

MR. A. Are you going to throw it aside and say 'Bring the milk of the male tiger'. That is not fair. Yet many people in England, testing us probably by this service standard, may pronounce us not sound, not fit for responsible government, but I do hope, sir, that there will be two or three clear sights, two or three shrewd people even in England, at this time, to say that the Indian Civil Service, the administrators of India, the executive, are really on their trial. They profess to be prepared in India, for a very early beginning of responsible government, when they would be willing not to impose, as they do, their will on the legislature but to take the will of the legislature and carry it out, when they will be the instruments of the legislature and not its masters. Are they preparing for the time by carrying in the teeth of the opposition, unanimous and unsparing, of their Indian colleagues, this measure through? Whom have you behind you now amongst Indians? The tragic story of India may be summed up in these words, that you have governed all these centuries in India in isolation and without having any responsible section of public opinion behind you. Now, at this supreme hour, have you, behind you no section of public opinion to support you? The nominated members have not given their blessing to this bill; the Zamindar members have not given their support, the lawyer members will have none of it; the members of commerce will have none of it; and yet, the Hon. Sir

George Lowndes told us, 'We must carry this legislation through, because we are satisfied that it is very right. We should have been glad of your support, but as you do not support us, we have to carry it through in spite of you.' I admire the courage of the Hon. the Law Member. 'I admire the candour with which he has said that the Government had responsibility to-day and the non-official members had none of that responsibility. I realise that we have none, and I refuse to believe that, when the case is placed before the public of England, they would say we had responsibility and that we shirked it. We have none. There is one remark, sir, which I must make and that, in justice to the feeling in the country of which, for the moment, I am the spokesman. I do not think the Hon. the Law Member could have meant all that he said when he said that some of us were indulging in

THREATS OF AGITATION.

I venture to think that no one here, who has spoken against the bill, indulged in anything which might truthfully be described as threat of agitation. None of us, certainly none of the moderates, I take leave to say, has power to go and stir up a violent agitation in the country. It is impossible. The agitation must be there. Already the heart must be throbbing if any words that we use here can possibly have any effect on the general political atmosphere. The agitation is there, I wish to assure my official colleagues, who had had a share yet in this business,

but if our appeals fall flat, if the bill goes through, I do not believe there is any one here who would be doing his duty if he did not join the agitation. That is not a threat, I take leave to think. That is by no means a threat. Anyhow I am the best judge of my own mind, and I do not indulge in any threats. I have yet borne no part in this agitation, but if everything goes wrong, if we are face to face with this legislation, how it is possible for me, with the views that hold, to abstain from agitation, I, for one cannot say.

Repeal of Repressive Laws

On Feb. 14, 1921 the Hon. Mr. Sastri moved in the Council of State, the important resolution urging the appointment of a Committee for the Repeal of the Repressive Laws. The Committee which was subsequently appointed recommended the withdrawal of the more obnoxious part of the Criminal Law Amendment Act which was the cause of all the trouble in 1919. Mr. Sastri said :—

SIR, the Resolution which I am about to move is in these words :—

'This Council recommends to the Governor-General in Council that a committee be appointed at an early date to examine the repressive laws now on the Statute-book, and report whether all or any of them should be repealed, and, in cases where repeal is not desirable, whether the laws in question should be amended and, if so, how.'

Sir, I am very grateful indeed that the Government have found it possible to bring my Resolution on the agenda paper on the first business-day of the Council. If I may say so, it is an indication of an admirable spirit of cordiality and friendliness, which, I hope, will characterise the future work of this Council. The purpose and aim of the reforms cannot be better expounded than in the weighty words addressed to us on the inauguration day by His Excellency the Viceroy, than whom no more authoritative exponent of the subject could be conceived. In

that statement we had the words 'For the first time the principle of autocracy, which had never been wholly discarded in all earlier reforms, was definitely abandoned.' That is a great point. There is no more to be in the government of this country the principle of autocracy. My Resolution practically asks Government to adopt the first of the many steps that will be required before this principle of autocracy is in fact extinguished on the Statute-book.

It would be incongruous with the popular liberty which we are confidently hoping that the new Councils will inaugurate ; it will be incongruous with that principle if the repressive laws at present on the Statute-book continued there in their present form. What these laws are I will barely mention later on. But for the present I must answer the question which must occur to many of you. Is this the time for any body to ask that repressive laws be abandoned or modified? With a due sense of responsibility, I answer the question in the affirmative. There is trouble, there is intense unrest. At any moment the forces of disorder may exhibit themselves in undesirable forms. It is not unnatural if the custodians of peace and order feel some hesitation as to the wisdom of striking off all the fetters on individual freedom and liberty that are now in their possession. Still considering how this unrest derives a great part of its nourishment from the very existence of these repressive measures, from the denial at various points in the life of a people, of that individual freedom which we

regard as essential to full citizenship, considering how the unrest is mainly caused by the feeling that there are too many of these restrictions on our citizenship, I think I shall not be guilty of forcing the pace of reform if I ask that we begin the work of conciliation by striking off some of these fetters and by weakening the force of others. For, after all, if sedition is to be adequately dealt with, it must be as a great man has said, by the removal of the matter of sedition. If that is our work, am I right in suggesting to the Council the procedure of the appointment of a committee for the purpose? The suggestion will be made later on that perhaps the wiser course will be for ourselves to strike off these fetters at once. I do not deny that there is much to be said for that course. But upon the whole, taking all things together, I am not satisfied that every one of these fetters can be struck off immediately. Perhaps one or two of these will still have to be preserved in a modified form on the Statute-book. I cannot be dogmatic on a subject of which I am very ignorant. Nevertheless I do wish to state as my conviction that upon the whole the Committee procedure that I am now recommending is the best way of approaching the problem. We shall not lose much time by adopting that course. Anyhow, even if the alternative suggestion that is going to be made to the Council be adopted, I take it that it will not be before the next Session of our Council that the effectuating measures can be carried out. My suggestion does not involve any further

delay than that. If the Committee which I propose should be appointed and instructed to report in good time so that at our next Session the necessary legislation, repealing and amending may be undertaken, everything that we wish would be got.

Touching the repressive laws themselves, I would divide them broadly into three classes. The first class is an offence in itself. Its presence on the Statute-book is a political danger and cannot be tolerated hereafter. To this class belongs the notorious Rowlatt Act, the unblest mother, I must say, of a monstrous brood of evil. Her we no longer wish to have on the Statute-book. Then there are the deportation Regulations of a very early date, the existence of which also has contributed a great deal to the political dissatisfaction which is gathering ahead. They date from 1818 to 1827 and refer to different parts of India. I do not think it will be at all difficult for a great Government like the Government of India to manage to administer the country along peaceful and progressive lines without being armed with these very old fashioned Regulations which constitute, if I may say so, a relic of a somewhat barbarous time. Then there are certain Acts, which it is highly desirable immediately to repeal. Herein I would include what is known as the Press Act, and the Act which authorises the Government of India to constitute special tribunals for the trial of certain offences. The Press Act, in particular, has been the cause of a great deal of discontent and dissatisfaction.

It has been held to be absolutely incompatible with a free press which we regard as one of the essential constituents of freedom. I am not quite competent to go into the various features of the Press Act. But about its general effect one is puzzled to say anything that will be generally acceptable. I am sometimes doubtful whether to describe the Press Act as a success or as a failure. At the present moment, at all events, the press in India, whether English or Vernacular, cannot be truly said to be very much deterred in the exercise of its freedom by the existence of the various provisions of the Press Act. That, however, is an accident of the policy that the Government is pursuing to-day rather than a necessary result of the nature of its provisions. These provisions are in themselves, no doubt, of a very restrictive nature, and on high authority it has been held that even the safeguards provided in the Act have not been so carefully provided as to secure suitable remedies to aggrieved parties.

I would, therefore, press on the Government—or rather on the Committee which I am suggesting should be appointed—I would press on the Committee the desirability of repealing altogether the Press Act, and, as I mentioned before, that other Act which authorises the appointment of special tribunals to try certain offences. Then, there are certain other Acts, which I will mention, but with regard to which I am by no means certain that it would be wise to repeal them. Possibly the best course is to examine

them carefully, with expert advice as to how best to amend them. In the category I would mention, for example, the Seditious Meetings Act, the Newspapers Incitement to Offences Act, and the Act relating to Conspiracies.

Sir, as a man not versed in law, I should be treading on dangerous ground if I proceed to examine in detail the various provisions of the Acts. But I think I have mentioned such a number of these restrictive Acts that I need not say much to recommend the appointment of a Committee to examine the whole body of these repressive laws. There are too many of them, and some of them are really too bad. We cannot afford to enter on a career of even partial responsible government with these menaces to popular freedom existing on the Statute-book.

I must now ask the Council's patience if I refer, as I cannot help referring, to the broader aspect of these questions. As I said before, this is one of the first steps we necessarily must take in the great work of conciliation, in the great work of placing the Reforms on a proper basis. I was not struck by any part of His Royal Highness' speech, great as it was, so much as by the passage in which he summed up in simple but pregnant words the experience of humanity in its struggle for freedom. The words are worth quoting, and I will make no apology to the Council for doing so:—

'Political freedom has often been won by revolution, by tumult, by civil war, at the price of peace and public safety. How rarely has it been the free gift of one people to another in response to a growing wish for greater liberty and to a growing evidence of fitness for its enjoyment?'

I cannot conceive of a more suitable answer to those, European and Indian, who are so sceptical as the final issue of the great work on which the Government of India has now entered than that passage. It gives us hope. It shows us at one glance the immense scope of the British Constitution, within the arms of which it is possible, by methods altogether peaceful and constitutional, to proceed from a condition of political dependence to a condition of absolute equality with Great Britain herself in the work of Empire. Often it has been doubted, and it has been thrown at the face of political agitators—‘Are you going to beat the record of humanity? Where is the people that has won its liberty except by bloodshed?’ That may or may not be, but we, England and India together, have resolved, if only we understand the genius of the Constitution of Great Britain, to achieve this unique feat in political growth. We will achieve freedom, and the whole of it, by entirely peaceful means. Let that be the resolution of each one of us in proceeding with the work that opens to-day. Difficulties there must be: let us together overcome them. Misunderstandings there must be: let us together clear them up. But revolution and tumult, and civil war there need not be if history can teach and mankind can learn. That, Sir, is non-violent co-operation. Not Non-Co-operation, which may begin in non-violence and in professions of non-violence, but through the imperfections and weaknesses of the material on which it

works, cannot but end in violence and bloodshed. To this work of co-operation I invite the Government to-day by means of this Resolution. Let us, with His Royal Highness' words still ringing in our ears, on this first business-day of the first Council, make this compact of high-hearted comradeship.

One word more. In giving such liberties as may seem suitable, in taking such steps as may seem advisable, let there be no reservations to the extent that you wish to go. Go ahead bravely and not haltingly. It is the most essential condition of success in this great work. But us no buts; let there not be a superabundance of ifs. So working, we certainly will do what no other people in the world have done, achieve full constitutional liberty within the British Empire by entirely peaceful and constitutional methods.

I move, Sir, the Resolution which stands in my name.

The Use of Fire Arms.

The Hon. Mr. Sastri moved in the Council of State at its meeting of the 3rd March 1921, a resolution urging the amendment of certain enactments in regard to the use of fire arms. In moving the resolution Mr. Sastri said :—*

SIR, in this Resolution I separate the use of fire-arms from other means that the authorities commonly employ to put down riots or unlawful assemblies. It seems to me that fire-arms being a deadly weapon, their use should be expressly sanctioned by the legislature and regulated carefully by its provisions. In England, a long series of judicial decisions and a Statute known as the Riot Act have placed this matter on an entirely legal basis, so that the law is definite and clear. In India, on the other

* This Council recommends to the Governor-General in Council that the Code of Criminal Procedure and, if necessary, other enactments, be so amended as to secure the following points in the suppression of riots and unlawful assemblies :—

(i) No fire-arms should be used except on the written authority of a Magistrate of the highest class that may be available on the spot ;

(ii) In cases of grave emergency when no Magistrate is available in the neighbourhood, the chief police or military officer present on the spot may, if he considers that the riot or unlawful assembly cannot be suppressed otherwise, employ fire-arms ; but the onus of proving the emergency and the impossibility of securing the presence of a Magistrate within the proper time shall lie on the officer so acting.

(iii) Before resorting to fire-arms, the Magistrate or other civil or military officer responsible shall read or cause to be

hand, a few meagre sections of the Criminal Procedure Code embody all the provisions governing this matter. It is curious that in those provisions there is no mention at all of fire-arms. The words used in that connection are merely 'force' and 'military force.' I do not mean at all to imply that military force or perhaps even the expression 'force' may not include the use of fire-arms. That is not my point. My complaint is this—that the use of such a weapon as a fire-arm in the suppression of a riot should not be expressly mentioned in a Statute that purports to govern the matter and regulate in detail all its provisions. It is to supply that defect that I have brought forward this Resolution. I have taken the opportunity to supply what seem to me to be a few great gaps in the law of India, gaps the result of which we have seen too prominently every now and then in the action of the authorities when they are confronted

read a proclamation, both in English and in the local vernacular, similar to that contained in the English Riot Act ;

(iv) Fire-arms shall not be used for one hour after such proclamation has been read unless in the meantime, the assembly or crowd actually causes serious damage to person or property ;

(v) Before the crowd is actually fired upon, the fullest warning shall be given ;

(vi) The Magistrate or other civil or military officer responsible shall take all reasonable precautions to see that no more injury is inflicted on the crowd or assembly than is absolutely necessary ;

(vii) The sanction of the Governor-General-in-Council should not be a condition precedent to the institution of a criminal prosecution against officers or other persons who have acted illegally in the suppression of riots ;

(viii) Every such prosecution shall be instituted in and triable by the Sessions Court having territorial jurisdiction, with the previous leave of such Court or the High Court of the Province.'

with occurrences of this nature. Now I will try to show you that, although my Resolution reads formidable on paper to those that are not familiar with the law on this subject, and although it includes a great variety of provisions, it really is nothing more than the reproduction of either the existing practice in India or the existing practice in England. Every single point that I make here is taken either from the Indian practice to-day or from the English law. 'No fire-arms should be used except on the written authority of a Magistrate of the highest class that may be available on the spot.' This is the provision in our own Code. Now whether the written authority of a Magistrate is always procurable may be open to question, but I contend that in English law or rather the practice of it, the written authority is an important requirement. I will refer to that matter a little later.

No. ii. I require here the presence of a Magistrate or if a Magistrate be not available, the Chief Police or Military officer may take the necessary action. That also is a provision contained in our own Code. Only I make it clear in the latter half that the onus of proving the emergency and the impossibility of procuring the presence of a Magistrate shall lie on the officer so acting. Now this is merely a recognition of the fact that the supervision of a riot or unlawful assembly is primarily the duty of the civil authority of the locality. If therefore at any time the civil authority has got to be superseded and

its functions assumed by another authority, the authority so assuming the functions must be carefully protected. It is in order to protect them that we say that they must secure the presence of a Magistrate, but if they cannot, they must satisfy themselves that when the matter is made the subject of a judicial proceeding or of a public inquiry, they should be able to show that they acted in an emergency which made the presence of a Magistrate impossible.

No. (iii). The Magistrate or other civil authority should read or cause to be read a proclamation similar to that contained in the English Riot Act. Now, here at once, before I make the marks appropriate to this head, I wish to state that the language of this particular sub-division of my Resolution leaves something out. I have not said anything as to what should happen in case the situation should not allow of the proclamation being read, in case before the authority proposing to act arrives on the spot, the riot or unlawful assembly should have been already committing excesses or should have got completely out of hand. I think, therefore, that a correction requires to be made, and I regret that I left the language in an imperfect state. It would be remedied if I said, for example, 'The Magistrate or other civil or military officer responsible shall, unless the situation has got out of hand in the meantime, read a proclamation, etc.' I am not using exactly legal language, but I am only trying to make the substance of my amendment clear. Now, the reading of the Riot Act

is a provision taken out of the English Law, which does not find mention in our books. Nevertheless, its object is simply to protect the authorities acting. Now, when life has to be taken and afterwards an inquiry or judicial proceeding takes place, it should not be possible for people who were excited at the time to come and say 'I do not know whether I did this or not.' The requirement that a certain proclamation should be made is so clear and striking, that no officer performing that operation would afterwards be in a position to plead that he forgot whether he did it or not. It is a land-mark in the course of the proceedings, and it is quite desirable that the Magistrate should, before he takes the extreme step, be compelled, if possible, and if the situation allows it, to take that step. It is not my ingenious view of the matter. That is the view taken by great authorities. Lord Haldane, giving evidence before a Committee that went into the use of the military on such occasions, expressly said that this was a protection. The Riot Act in 99 cases out of 100 is read. 'It is for the protection of the Magistrate and the military. It forms an additional protection.'

Then too, the reading of the Riot Act and the provision that follows, namely, that an hour should be allowed to elapse before fire-arms are actually used, is also for the purpose of giving time for the riotous assembly to disperse. As a matter of fact, those who have been mixed up with such crowds

will easily appreciate the difficulty of extricating ones' self from such a place. A man may be perfectly willing to run away from the spot, but he would find it extremely difficult to do so unless he was very strong and very determined and had a number of comrades to help him in the escape. It is really for the separation of the guilty part of the assembly from the innocent part of the assembly that this time of one hour is generally given in the English law. I might say that that is not my view, but the view taken by high authorities. I would just read again the evidence of Viscount Haldane:

'I have known of no case of a riot in which it has not been known that the Riot Act was being read, as the Magistrate is seen with something in his hand and though they could not hear it if he read it ever so loudly they can see it read and the lawful part of them disperses; it is the riotous part that remains.'

I will read a passage from another writer who says the same thing. He rejoices in the happy name of Wise. He says:

'The timely warning given by the reading of the Riot Act brings many to a sense of their danger and, as far as possible, ensures the speedy vindication of the law, or at least the separation of the innocent from the guilty.'

Now, it may be said, to allow an hour to lapse might be a very dangerous thing when the authorities are faced with a determined mob. It is perfectly true. Nobody says that this hour should in any and every case be allowed to lapse. I have provided, unless in the meantime the mob gets out of hand and perpetrates felonious crimes, in which case, even before the hour is over, the authorities are free

to resort to the use of fire-arms and to adopt extreme measures.

Then the next thing that we come to is No. v :

' Before the crowd is actually fired upon, the fullest warning should be given.'

Now that is a provision already contained in our Police Manual. It is nothing new, that the fullest warning should be given. Now the meaning of this warning has been somewhat misunderstood. People used to think some years ago that this warning consisted in the Police at first discharging a few blank cartridges. That, however, is an idea that has now been absolutely exploded, and I will just read the reason which Viscount Haldane alleges as underlying this abandonment of the practice of using blank cartridges at first.

He was asked ' Do you think it desirable to use blank cartridges first of all, after the Riot Act is read?' ' It is most undesirable, because the mob get it into their minds that you have nothing but blank cartridges and they come out and get killed.' The military authorities say ' We are here and if we use our fire-arms it is to kill. That is why we demur to being called on except in the last and most perilous necessity. If the mob get the impression we are there with only blank cartridges they will come along and get killed, and the result will be bloodshed galore.' This provision, that no blank cartridges should be used, has been adopted recently in all our police and drill manuals. So that on that point the

practice here has been brought into line with the English practice.

No. vi.

'The Magistrate or other Civil or Military Officer responsible shall take all reasonable precautions to see that no more injury is, inflicted on the crowd or assembly than is absolutely necessary.'

That is contained in our Code already. It is also in our Police Manual, and it is in entire conformity with the English practice.

Clause (vii) says that 'the sanction of the Governor-General-in-Council should not be a condition precedent to the institution of criminal proceedings against officers or other persons who have acted illegally in the suppression of riots.' This, too, is in conformity with the English practice. In England, it is considered axiomatic that, where a severe step of this kind has had to be taken by the authorities, the individuals aggrieved or the public should have it in their power to bring the proceedings under the scrutiny of a judicial tribunal; a Judge and Jury determine the matter and the individual subject who feels himself aggrieved has his remedy. I do not think the idea would be tolerated for a minute in England that these proceedings should not be made the subject of scrutiny in a court of law. In fact, if I may read for one moment a great authority on the Law of the Constitution, Dicey, we see this :—

'Officers, Magistrates, soldiers, policemen, ordinary citizens, all occupy in law the same position. They are each and all of them bound to withstand and put down breaches of the peace, such as riots and other disturbances. They are, each and all o-

them, authorised to employ so much force, even to the taking of life, as may be necessary for that purpose, and they are, none of them, entitled to use more.'

Here follows the important part—

'They are, each and all of them, liable to be called to account before a jury for the use of excessive, that is, of unnecessary force.'

Now, from the evidence from which I have been reading so often, from all text-books on the subject of English law, from the common law text-book written by that great authority, Odgers, passages could be cited which, however, I will not do on this occasion, to show that the judicial tribunals are always open to receive complaints against the use of excessive or unnecessary force. It is only in India that it has been considered necessary practically to shut out all such inquiry from law courts. I use the word 'practically', because our Code says that such proceedings may be instituted with the previous sanction of the Governor-General-in-Council. I do not know why. We know that in all Provinces there have occurred riots and unlawful assemblies fairly frequently; riots and unlawful assemblies have had to be put down and lives have been lost. Nevertheless, we have not got one reported case on the subject in our body of reports. In other words, either the people have not applied for the sanction of the Governor-General-in-Council and sought remedy in the Courts, or where such application was made it has not been granted. I do not know which the fact is; but one thing we know; we must not draw hastily any inference from this fact. You must not suppose that because there have

been no published reports on this subject, the public in India have always been quite satisfied that on every occasion that the authorities have employed fire-arms, they employed them rightly and they employed them just to the extent required and no more. On the contrary, most of us know that immediately such a thing happens, lots of complaints appear in the papers and loud demands appear for a public inquiry ; and I do not think I am exaggerating facts at all when I say that in nearly all these cases, within my experience, there has been left a soreness of feeling in the minds of the public that the law has not been vindicated. At any rate their minds are left in a state of great dissatisfaction. Now, I venture to think that it is absolutely necessary that we should place the Indian law on this matter on just the same footing as the English law, and that we should allow people who feel themselves aggrieved to go to courts of law without let or hindrance. Sir James FitzJames Stephen, that great authority on Indian law as on all law, has given a reason why in India this very great restriction is placed on the institution of judicial proceedings as a result of the suppression of riots or assemblies by force.

The two great reasons he gives are these, that if that was permitted, a great number of law suits, both civil and criminal, would be launched against the officers acting, and it would be impossible to deal with them. The second reason alleged is, that this particular evil will grow worse and worse as the

Indian lawyer grows in strength and in efficiency. Now, I can understand executive officers sympathising with arguments of that kind. I can understand officers called upon to exercise these severe powers naturally shrink from being called upon subsequently to account for the way in which they have been used. But I would ask fair-minded people to consider whether it is perfectly right that such extraordinary power as the taking of life should be given to the executive in any country without their being called upon subsequently to explain the circumstances in which they used that great power. It seems to me that the claim of the executive in this country to set up as their own judges is absolutely without justification. They cannot say 'if we have used fire-arms we will ourselves later on make an inquiry and then publish the information to the world that we have found everything satisfactory'. If you entrusted mere money to an officer and asked him to spend it, you all require that somebody else should come and audit it, not that officer himself or his executive superior. The other day we were told by the Honourable the Finance Minister that we are going to have an Auditor General who is going to examine the way in which all monies are spent by officers of the Government, and being himself independent of the Government of India should report only to the Secretary of State. Now, if that is the ordinary principle to be observed in matters where money is concerned, ought not the same principle to be applied

where you have human lives to regard? People come and take away human lives. They may have done so with every justification, but the public have got the right to insist that that matter should be inquired into. It is for the protection of the executive themselves that they must not say 'we are so self-righteous that if we are satisfied that everything was right, everybody else shall be satisfied as well.' I think that is a position which the executive ought not any longer to take. Now the essence of a good law, I have heard jurists explain, is not the mere enactment of substantive provisions, but the embodiment of suitable remedies at law. It is not enough to vest a right in a man. You must further provide that he has the power and the unrestricted opportunity of exercising that right. It is not enough to impose an odious duty on the executive. You must further empower the law courts to see that the executive have used their power properly and with due regard to public safety. It is the presence of remedies rather than the presence of substantive provisions that constitute the merit of any law, and I am afraid the provisions of the Criminal Procedure Code on this subject, judged by this test, fail lamentably. There are no remedies. Now the two ways in which ordinarily this matter is satisfactorily settled are either by a judicial proceeding such as is so frequently reported in English Law Reports, or by means of a public inquiry. Now, I have already explained to the Council how the first remedy is practically shut

against us. The requirement that the Governor-General-in-Council should previously sanction such a prosecution has effectually shut that remedy against us. What is the other remedy? A public inquiry, which will satisfy the people concerned that everything has been done with due care and caution. Now what happens in India? It is remarkable, I cannot conceive of people being shot down in England without the Ministers responsible being ready at a moment's notice, to grant an inquiry, should any one say he was not satisfied and he wanted an inquiry.

In India, most extraordinary to think, you find that the public have to kick about and agitate and cry aloud and raise a hue and cry before the Government will appoint a public investigation. I think that is not as it should be. The authorities responsible should be ready, especially as they have shut out judicial courts from access, always to grant a public inquiry: 'here we are, we have done our duty, you come and examine matters.' On the other hand, if after very great trouble we secure an inquiry, I have known a Government appoint the head of the district himself to conduct the inquiry! The head of the district whose conduct and whose mishandling of the situation has brought about the whole affair, he himself, in one case, sat to inquire. In another case that I remember, the finding was that the fire-arm or the rifle went off by accident. Now this accidental firing is a thing with which we are fairly familiar in India. It is not only in the suppression of a riotous

assembly. Even in judicial trials, when people have been shot down, we have often known a rifle to go off by accident. Now I do not wish to be very hard, but I think the military authorities would be well advised, if things go on like this hereafter, to require all manufacturers of rifles and all other fire-arms to label every item that they sell 'warranted not to go off at its own will.' Now, we do not want the fire arms in the possession of the police or the military any longer to go off of themselves. Then, in another case that I know of (it is quite recent) the Government promised an inquiry but for some reason, they laid themselves open to grave suspicion by subsequently refusing it; the suspicion being that in the course of their own departmental inquiry, they came upon facts which they did not like the public to know and which a public inquiry would certainly have exposed. Now, things of that kind are intolerable in a well-developed system of jurisprudence. I venture to ask one question. This Honourable House may remember time after time when the Executive came to us with requests for power, when the Press Act, for example, was passed, when the Rowlatt Act was passed, and we called in question the provisions, the invariable answer from the Executive was,— 'Why do you object to this? Are you ever going to offend against these salutary provisions? It is when a wicked person transgresses these necessary provisions that we are going to collar him by means of this law. Why do you object? You are a respecta-

ble man; why need the innocent be afraid of a measure of this kind?'

Now, Sir, in political controversies it is an exceeding joy to be able to hoist people with their own petard. If I see that judicial remedies should be made available, open and unrestricted after acts of this kind, why should the innocent officers care at all? Should they come forward?

The Honourable the President. I would remind the Honourable Member that his time is already up and he has yet to develop head No (viii). I would ask him to do so as shortly as possible.

The Honourable Mr Srinivasa Sastri: I will only say one word on No. (viii) before I sit down. I am very thankful to the Honourable the President for allowing me to continue after my time is up.

In No. (viii) I provide something like a half-way house between the unrestricted allowance of judicial proceedings which prevails in England and the very restricted manner in which that thing operates in India. Judicial proceedings shall be tried, I provide, only in courts of high standing, in Sessions Courts, and even in their case they should not be instituted as of course, but with previous leave obtained, because I understand that it would be a check on frivolous prosecutions.

I move the Resolution which stands in my name.

The Guildhall Speech.

[In accepting the Freedom of the City conferred by the Corporation of London on July 29, 1921, the Rt. Hon. Mr. Sastri delivered a speech as unexceptionable in sentiment as it was happy in expression. He said :—]

I am keenly sensible of the great honour I have just received at the hands of the Corporation of London. In the few well chosen words with which I was introduced the wish was expressed that my influence and popularity amongst my countrymen may increase. I feel profoundly grateful for that wish and hope that it may be fulfilled, for if I am sure of nothing else I am sure of this that there is very great scope indeed for improvement in that direction. (Laughter). I accept the freedom of the City of London not as a personal distinction, but in all sincerity and hopefulness as a symbol and prelude to the conferment on India of the freedom of the British Empire. (Cheers). On the highest authority the British Empire has been declared to be without distinction of any kind. Neither race nor colour nor religion are to divide man from man so long as they are subjects of this Empire. (Cheers). As in the great temple of Jagannath in my country, where the Brahman and the outcaste, the priest and the

pariah, alike join in a common devotion and worship, so in this British Empire, which, by your leave, I will call the greatest Temple of Freedom on this planet—(Cheers)—he blasphemes and violates her freedom who raises barriers of one kind or another, or says to his fellow worshippers—"there shalt thou abide, come not near me."

The joys of freedom are indeed difficult to describe; they can only be fully appreciated by those who have had the misfortune to lose them for a time. With grief and sorrow I occasionally notice that here and there are people who speak of freedom as though it were a mechanical invention, or the quick specific for which they have taken up a patent. (Laughter.) "Our ancestors" say they, "have fought, have struggled, have sacrificed and have suffered for freedom. It is ours exclusively. We will not share with those who have not shared our antecedent troubles, trials and misfortunes to attain it. Come, take it if you can, but give it we will not." I take it that that is not an exalted view of freedom. Humanity would be but a poor witness to the wisdom of the All Wise, if the experience through which it has gone were to yield benefit only to those who have gone through it. History would be a dead thing, all our trials and misfortunes would be superfluous, if we compelled posterity in its turn to go through similar ordeals. What a man has fought for and won he must without reserve or qualification share with his fellowmen. (Cheers.) Sanitarians preach that you

can never enjoy the best health in your house till your surroundings are also well developed in the matter of hygiene. Philosophers tell us that you can best seek your own happiness only by serving for the happiness of others. So I believe no man will enjoy to the fullest measure the blessings of freedom unless he shares them to the full with his fellowmen. (Cheers.)

Like culture, like knowledge, like virtue, and like spiritual merit, freedom is a thing which, the more it is given the more it grows; the more it is spread wide on all lands and soils, the more it takes from the substance where it dwells and in return gives out in greater abundance of beauty and colour and bliss for all. He who would circumscribe freedom to particular areas and to certain peoples knows not what he is doing, for he is taking away from humanity a possible contribution to its richness and glory, a contribution which I take it to be the will of Providence that every race, every people should make in its own good time.

So, ladies and gentlemen, if you have come into this great heritage of freedom, representative institutions, Parliamentary Government and every form of human equality which civilizations have evolved, be not like the miser who keepeth his goods to himself but gets no benefits from them, only evoking the envy and hatred of the neighbourhood and, alas, even of his own family. Rather let it be said of you that you kept not the best for yourselves and your children and grandchildren unto remote generations. Rather

let this be said of your country in regard to India:
" England took charge of a people divided from her
by colour, by race and by culture. She fitted them
for the tasks of Empire, and when the time was ripe
she gladly admitted them to be full and equal part-
ners in the glory of Empire and the service of huma-
nity." (Loud and long, continued cheers.)

Speech at the League of Nations.

The following is the full text of the Rt. Hon. Mr. Sastri's speech in the Assembly of the League of Nations at Geneva in the year 1921, in discussing the work of the Council and Secretariat of the League :—

MR. President and Brother and Sister Delegates, as you have been informed, I come from India, separated from you by many thousands of miles, but I trust you will recognise akin to you, alike in loyalty to the League, in the spirit of humanity, and in zeal for the welfare of our kind. Coming rather late in this debate, I have had the rare advantage of listening to many speeches in connection with our work. I have heard a note here and there of pessimism. I do not wonder. I have heard much criticism, valuable and wholesome to those who are engaged in high and serious tasks, but I am happy to think that the dominant note of all the speeches has been one of hope for the future, enthusiasm for the ideals that underlie our work, and for the peace and good-will amongst the nations of the world that we wish to see established on a firm and unalterable basis. I confess I have been moved to my inmost depths by what I have seen and heard. Hard and cold, indeed, must be the heart that fails to be touched, and touched to

noble issues, by a spectacle such as this. The nations of the world foregather from the ends of our continents, representing many shades of colour, many varieties of political and social thought, and many states and grades of culture and advance in all directions—peoples small and great, weak and strong, but all alike weary of the mistaken past, eager for a better day for mankind, and resolved, with bruised and bleeding hearts, to stand by higher ideals for human kind.

And yet one has very often been hearing, during the last few days, of people standing outside the Organisation, criticising our work as from a different planet, unconcerned spectators whose only duty is to find fault and fix blame on particular people. I confess I have no patience with that sort of critic. The friendly appraiser of good and evil, who is anxious for improvement, one has use for; one can listen to him with respect and with attention! but to those who will not take a share in the work we can only turn a deaf ear to their cold criticisms. When a man has told me: "The League has not done this," I am inclined to ask whether he is not to blame for it. When he has told me: "There are these tasks still unfinished," I am inclined to ask him: "Why do you not come in and lend a helping hand?" (*Applause*). If he says "There is no room for me in the Assembly, which consists only of a certain number of people," my answer to him is that, there is work inside the Assembly and there is work outside the Assembly.

The work outside is not less important, not less necessary, but sometimes far more difficult, far more onerous and far more exhausting, I may say, than the work inside the Assembly. We want an army of workers in every country to educate the hearts of the people to make them realise the high aims and tasks of this League of Nations, and, in fact to be propagandists, in season and out of season, amidst discouragement and cynicism and difficulties of every sort. We can spare many critics of the kind that I have alluded to, and wish for helpers, in this spirit.

We have been bidden to cast our glance down the list of contents to be able to appreciate the magnitude and variety, the delicacy and the difficulty, of the tasks undertaken by the League. That represents, no doubt, a great part of the truth. But I would ask people not merely to be content to look at the table of contents, but to turn also to the inside pages of the Report that has been presented to us. There we shall see accounts of great work undertaken and great work accomplished. It may be that the Report is not presented in an attractive and literary form, but we can read between the lines. We can read the anxiety, we can read the industry, we can read the plans carefully made and vigorously executed for the accomplishment of the record that is down therein. If the League has so far been rather cautious in undertaking work, I ask : Is that necessarily a defect ? We all know how long great institutions take to strike root, and as we know that this League is break-

ing entirely new ground, we should wait in patience for great results, should we not? Do we not know, that those who snatch before the time often fail of their grasp and come to grief? Should we rather that the League undertook impossible tasks, came into collision with the great Powers, and tried to upset and go against human nature, and thus dash all our hopes for the future? Should we not rather praise the League for the cautious steps it takes, so that the first tasks that it undertakes it may carry on to a successful and triumphant conclusion, that it may thereby be enabled in the face of the world to undertake the greater tasks that lie ahead.

I believe in the wisdom of the old proverb that you ought not to bite off more than you can chew. That the League has limited its scope and its activity I regard rather as a merit and proof of wisdom, than as an occasion for adverse criticism. Should we not wish for more? Take, for instance, this war between Greece and Turkey. We all wish that it were in the power of the League to have prevented this in the beginning or to terminate it to-day.

It seems almost as though the nations of Europe had made up their minds that, when human passions are at their worst, instead of allaying and diverting them, the right and proper thing was to let them work themselves out in their malignant fury and virulence.

Take, again, the question of Upper Silesia. What better testimony to the promise that the League has

so far held out than that the Supreme Council should, in their perplexity, have yielded up this question of great moment to the solution of this great organisation? It is a great test and a great opportunity for the League of Nations to establish itself in the heart, not only of Europe, but of the civilised world. I know that it is the Council, and not the Assembly, which is charged with the great task of settling this problem. Nevertheless, the Assembly has a mighty role to perform in this matter. Whether in this matter of Upper Silesia, or any other great tasks between the Powers, the Council has a very delicate and a very onerous responsibility resting on its shoulders. It may do its work with the utmost impartiality, with the most conspicuous ability, with the most unwearied industry; nevertheless, for the results of its work to be acceptable, for its judgments to be taken by the great Powers concerned, it is necessary that the sympathy and support of the Assembly should be constantly in attendance on the work of the Council at every stage. The Assembly cannot afford to efface itself in this matter. We, representing the different peoples of the world, are in a measure custodians of the peace of the world. We, I dare to say it, are the authentic voice by means of which the conscience of the world will speak. Our duty lies here, to try and understand, to wait in patience till the Council is able to take us into its confidence, and then, with due discrimination and with a sense of responsibility, to stand behind the Council and lend them our hearty

support. The Council will find it necessary, therefore, from time to time to be in living touch with opinion in the Assembly, with the wishes and feelings of the Members represented here, and likewise, also, at every stage to publish such records as may be safely published, so that they may have behind them, as I said, always the moral support of the Assembly. I do not say that the Council are going to fail in giving this due publicity, but I think it is necessary, from every point of view, to add our voice to the great demand that has been made on them so far by demanding that this publicity should never at any moment be neglected.

It is just possible that in the greatness of their task the Council may feel deterred by undue public criticism. It is just possible—who knows? We are dealing with human nature—it is just possible that they may sometimes like to wrap themselves up in oligarchic mystery. It is necessary, therefore, for the Members of this Assembly to assure them that if they treat us in the proper spirit, their goodwill and confidence will be reciprocated in abundant measure, and rewarded a thousandfold. We, for our part, have often been criticised as representatives of the little Powers, more or less, like units in a democratic Assembly, to be treated with consideration, but never to be fully trusted, and oftentimes to be set aside as noisy brawlers.

Brother and Sister Delegates, criticism of this sort is bound to come. We know there are always

plenty of people who rail at democracy, democracy whether amongst individuals or amongst the nations of the world. We have, therefore, to remember that, in the face of hostile opinion, we have got to establish ourselves as people who will do their great duty without fear or favour. Some of us may be small, and may be threatened by the larger Powers around us: others amongst us may be in search of commercial and trading facilities, and may find it necessary, therefore, if they are prudent, to accommodate ourselves to the selfish plans of other people. I think that our supreme duty lies in believing, as has been pointed out by the Delegates from Belgium and Persia, that we are not here to further the interests of the countries which we may happen immediately to represent, but we must constantly bear in mind that we are each and every one of us, bound to act in the interests of all the others; that we are cosmopolitan really, that we are citizens of the world, and not merely of the limited countries which we happen for the moment to represent. We must resolutely refuse to be brought by any bribe, whether of political privilege or of trade facilities. We must not be daunted by fears of aggression by powerful neighbours, and we must, without haste and without rest, proceed, in the daily work here, to speak and to vote in obedience solely to our conscience and our sense of duty.

Now, from the particular view of India, I have a few observations to make to which I solicit your kind and indulgent attention. One word in the

beginning I must say about disarmament. On this subject we have heard weighty opinions. Mr. Balfour in particular, in a cautious and impressive speech, marked by that fine poise and balance for which he is famous amongst the philosophers and statesmen of the world, has told us to be patient a little, and not to expect considerable results in this direction. He has reminded us that, although the war has harrowed and chastened our feelings in a very considerable measure, the character of humanity is not yet radically altered. In his own words, we do not yet constitute a peaceable world. That was quite true, when one comes to think of it, but how I wish—how, I take it, you all wish—that, for once, Mr. Balfour was in the wrong and it was possible to promise ourselves in the immediate future a large measure of general disarmament amongst the Powers of the world. India, distracted and suffering under anxieties of a particular kind, with resources of a very limited character, largely undeveloped, would welcome disarmament, because you may remember that, although the quarrel was not ours, we willingly and gladly came into the war with our own little bit.

But, even assuming that general disarmament on a considerable scale was undertaken, it is very doubtful how far India will come in for a great share of it, for her troubles, unfortunately, come from Afghanistan and from Russia, and to some extent from Turkey also, all three of them Powers which to-day stand outside the League, but which, we hope

on some near date, will come within our League and partake of its spirit of conciliation and pacification. The attitude of India toward this League is well illustrated by the measures that our Government have so far taken to carry out the resolution and proceedings of the Washington Conference on Labour. That great Conference was attended by the usual quota of Indian representatives. As soon as they came back they reported to us, and the result is that, almost alone amongst the Great Powers, India has not only ratified the Conventions which she was bound to ratify, but she has also put on her Statute Book a law dealing with the various aspects of the labour problem dealt with at the Conference. And we have another measure, now in contemplation, and we shall proceed with the task and complete it before our next Session is over.

I wish it were possible to claim for many other nations that they have also ratified and undertaken legislation in pursuance of the resolutions of the Washington Labour Conference. Nevertheless, when it comes to giving us some representation on the Bureau of the International Labour Conference we are told that we are not amongst the great industrial Powers of the world, and we are put aside. I hope that, when the next occasion comes round for considering this matter, the claims of India as a great industrial Power, determined to be loyal to the resolutions of the Labour Conference, will be treated with greater consideration.

Then, I have two grievances to bring before you. Without grievances we cannot live as most of you know. One of these grievances is easily remediable. The other grievance I will not say is irremediable, but it is less susceptible of a remedy.

The first grievance relates to our representation in the Secretariat of the League. I will not go into figures. I am anxious to keep on the right side with the Secretariat, and I will not antagonise them by going into any vast array of figures. But I wish to say one thing. When we are taxed for the expenses of the League, we are ranked very high indeed. We come in the first or the second class. Last time we paid about 4.8 per cent. of the expenses, and, under the new scheme, we are told we must go up to about 6 per cent. or a little over. I will mention only one or two things in this connection. Of about 351 members of the Establishment, 138 are British, 73 are French, 16 are Swiss, and the Americans, who are not yet Members of the League—I do not grudge their share—come in for 13. Where does India stand? She has one solitary representative. I do not ask for an increase in our representation as any reward for our virtue; but I offer this suggestion to the League with every confidence; that our men, taken from the disciplined ranks of our public services, will be found not inferior to any in the world with whom they may be brought into competition, either for efficiency, or for industry, or for devotion to their work, and as a highly evolved system of administra-

tion, which has justly received the encomiums of competent critics throughout the world, I can assure the Secretariat that they will receive much valuable assistance from the Members of our Services, if only they will be good enough to take them in.

Now for the grievance which is somewhat less remediable, and I would ask the Assembly to listen to me with indulgence, for this is a somewhat delicate question. I refer to Mandates. Lord Robert Cecil, whose services to the League, whose zeal for her cause, and attachment to her ideals are beyond praise, has already tabled a resolution on this subject and the President has admonished us that it would be wise to defer detailed criticism on this question until the Committee to which it is entrusted has reported on the subject. Now, I abide by that ruling: but my question is concerned not with the "A" and "B" Mandates, with which that Committee is concerned, but with the "C" Mandates, which the Assembly, I understand, accepted last year and passed for operation. The "C" Mandates are entrusted to certain Powers whose territories lie near the Mandated areas. I will read from the Article the part which deals with the point that I wish to bring before you. It says that the Mandatories ought to administer the Mandated Territories under their own laws as integral portions of their territories—"under their own laws."

Brother and Sister Delegates, some of these Powers that have received the "C" Mandate have

laws and regulations, and habits of administration derived from those laws and regulations, which, in effect, introduce a colour bar, make invidious distinctions between white and coloured races, and, in general do not hesitate to subject coloured populations within their areas to certain hardships and, I am sorry to add, even indignities. It will be in their power to apply such laws and regulations and habits of administration, under the Mandates, to those areas.

Let us remember, in the first place, that in those areas (I am referring in particular to German West Africa) the Germans did not make a colour bar or introduce these invidious distinctions; and, furthermore, these Powers receive Mandates and execute them on behalf of the League. To use language used in another part of the Covenant, they are to regard the liberties of their subjects as a sacred trust of civilisation. Nothing has, so far, been done to occasion any complaint on my part. I am anxious, however, to take time by the forelock, and to request these Mandatory Powers to use their wide powers with discretion, and with a due regard to the sacred character of the trust that they have undertaken, in other words, to behave worthily of the great and noble objects of the League of Nations, and not merely to be content to act in conformity with their own imperial ideas. I appeal, in particular, to my friends, Lord Robert Cecil and his worthy and distinguished colleagues

in the representation of South Africa in this League so to use their undoubted moral authority and influence that, neither I nor my successor in the representation of India, nor Japan, the permanently represented Power in the Council, which has also had occasion to protest against the terms of this Mandate, will find it necessary to come on this platform and tell the Assembly that we are worse off under the trustees of the League than we were under the Germans. Either rectify matters or put us back where we were. It would be a matter of the profoundest regret for any of us to come and speak in that fashion in the Assembly. I have no doubt that it would cause you great pain and grief to hear such a thing. I venture to think that it will also be to the Council, who have issued these Mandates, a matter of great uneasiness and scorching of heart.

Great Men of Bengal.

[Early in March 1922 the Rt. Hon. Mr. Sastri gave a dinner at the Carlton Hotel, London, in honour of Lord Lytton prior to his departure to India as Governor of Bengal. Mr. Sastri as host made an impressive speech in the course of which he recounted the glory of Bengal and her great contribution to the culture of modern India, and said:—]

SOMETIME ago I read that if you wished to win the hearts of Frenchmen you have to admire their great city of Paris and pay a tribute to the beauty of their women, and you must not omit to refer to the immense sacrifices they underwent during the Great War. Well, Lord Lytton will find that the Bengalis are in some respects like the French. They are a very emotional, a very excitable and a handsome people, and so devoted to their capital that a compliment paid to Calcutta would not be wasted (Laughter). Bengal is also like France in being proud of its fair sex.

I know that some of my friends here, Mr. Cotton amongst them, will claim that Bengal is the first province in India, and I do not dispute that in many respects this is the case. For instance, Bengal has produced some of the first men in India in modern days: the first orators, the first poets, the

first painters, the first musicians of India all come from the swamps of Eastern and Western Bengal. Within the present century Bengal has also established a reputation as having led a successful agitation on a matter on which local opinion was deeply stirred against the might of the British Government. They are very fond indeed of asserting that after a severe struggle lasting for some years they compelled the British Government to annul the Partition of Bengal.

During that struggle, whatever may be said of the immediate result, there arose, and we all gratefully acknowledge the fact, the new spirit of nationality, the ambition throughout India to become one united nation. The will to come together in political and other matters as one people then took root, and it is a fact with which all must reckon. *Swadeshi*, the spirit of nationalism as we now understand it, had its origin distinctly in those days, and although there were many things about the conduct of that agitation of which I for one strongly disapprove, I cannot but admit now that the whole matter has passed into history that very important political results emerged from what was in the first instance a provincial agitation. * * * *

Bombay Liberal Conference Address.

The following is the text of the opening speech which the Rt. Hon'ble V. S. Srinivasa Sastri delivered as President of the First Provincial Liberal Conference in Bombay on May 7, 1922.

SIR Dinshaw Wacha, Brother Delegates, Ladies and Gentlemen:—It is a great privilege, for which I cannot be too thankful, to preside over the proceedings of this Conference. I am under a great debt to my friend Sir C. Setalvad for the generous terms in which he has referred to me and to my qualifications for this office. As to Mr. Pheroze Sethna, I really do not know what to say. I had never realized that to his many accomplishments he added the faculty of unmitigated adulation, and I have no doubt an intelligent audience like you will know how to discount the praise, which he has so generously bestowed on me, as proceeding from the gross partiality of friendship.

Ladies and gentlemen, I must begin with a word of apology both to the Conference and to the press for the fact that I am unable to read a written address, not from lack of will, but altogether, believe me, from lack of time. It would have been so convenient to everybody. It would have saved you the strain of attention and to me it would have been

much saving of time as well. But it has not been possible and no one can regret it more than I do.

Then I have a word to say about the subject on which I am about to address you. I could have wished that it were possible for me to speak to you on those various details of administration in Bombay upon which, doubtless, your deepest feelings are engaged. But in the first place I am not equipped sufficiently well with the necessary knowledge, and in the second place I am afraid I should render myself open to very serious criticism if I avoided deliberately the one topic which, I take it, is in the minds of the whole of the people of this country, namely, the present situation, and what to do in the immediate future to relieve it.

There is just another word of preliminary interest which I must utter. I have not had the time to consult friends of the Liberal party all over the country. I have not therefore the moral authority of the Liberal party in the views that I shall express and must ask you to remember that these views are my own and I do not commit you to them at all. On the contrary you will see perhaps that in more than one matter my views conflict with those that may result from your deliberations and it will be my pleasure, as it will be my duty to adjust myself to those views that come out of your deliberations so far as it is compatible with my conscience.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, it will not be an exaggerated way of putting the question if I ask you

just to consider whether there is peace amongst us to-day, peace not from the circumstance of war, but peace from the circumstance of civil disturbance. Perhaps you will at once think of the distinction, natural enough, between outward and inward peace. And while some of you may think that there is the appearance of peace on the surface, there is in reality nothing like that peace of heart, that contentment, that satisfaction which we describe as really the inward peace of the soul. That there is not, but just one preliminary doubt. Is there really any full-blown outward peace amongst us? I remember quite well, while coming on board, just before landing in Bombay, being racked with anxiety as to what might be taking place in this country in consequence of the arrests that were proceeding. It was then a matter of as great relief as of surprise to be told that the peace of the country had not been outwardly disturbed. The thankfulness of my heart at that time knew no bounds, and when I asked the people the reason, they felt equally surprised, in fact they were very divided as to the reason. With the actual reason we are not concerned, but we are all I think profoundly grateful that those days should have passed away without adding to the great troubles with which we had been beset some time ago. But then, one hears now and then, although without much emphasis or conviction, of a possible resumption of a campaign of civil disobedience, I take it that Liberals as we are, not knowing the

secrets of the Non-Co-operation movement, we still believe that that talk need not be taken altogether seriously ; that outward peace is really established is my conviction. And now, if outward peace is established, the next question is, how we of this party should co-operate with others in the country in order to convert this outward peace into an inward and lasting peace. I have no doubt that we have suffered enough by division and should stand to gain enormously if we could promise ourselves a decade or two in advance of perfect contentment and order and progress. Now, it seems to me that in order that we may consider that question with absolute freedom, we should, even at the risk of doing an unpleasant task, consider the nature of the movement of which the outward activity has now ceased and which may be said to lie down to-day under the exhaustion of a great effort. It is not my purpose at all to stir up dispute or to utter a word which might give rise to an embittered controversy, but certainly we Liberals have to make up our minds as to the character of the movement of which for the moment we see a suspension.

Now, the Non-Co-operation movement, let me say at the outset (and this word proceeds I need not tell you from my heart), has had the exceptional advantage of having from the very start functioned under the guidance of one whose character is above cavil and whose motives are beyond suspicion. (Cheers.) Such a movement naturally enjoyed a great

advantage and I must now proceed to give here again an unaffected tribute to the way in which its great prestige and popularity were lent, although for the time being only to the great social causes that we all have at heart, the question for example of the elevation of the depressed classes, the removal of untouchability, the question of temperance, including now-a-days that of prohibition, and the all comprehensive subject, no less dear to our hearts than to those of others, that of Swadeshi. May I yet again proceed to record in equally sincere terms my admiration of the way in which this movement has carried to the remotest parts of the country the gospel of Swaraj, the way in which it has evoked the patriotic sense of your young people and upheld to them the high duty of sacrifice on behalf of the motherland? But, now, ladies and gentlemen, I must mention over against this some of the harm that this movement has caused amidst us and I do it in sorrow rather than in anger or in a spirit of recrimination.

You will pardon me then if I mention these things *seriatim* without making much comment, but just enumerating them as I pass along. This movement has caused the destruction of much valuable property, public and private. It has caused the loss of many a life; it has indirectly been the means of the deprivation of the liberties of nearly 20,000 of our fellow-countrymen; it has strengthened the hands of the executive who now employ the

forces of repression almost without restraint; it has increased, rather I would say it has given more than a decent excuse for, the maintenance (and an increase even) of the military burdens of our land: it has caused outbursts of ill-feeling as between races and as between communities almost unparalleled in the history of this sore-stricken land. Strange to say, so far as a part of my own Presidency is concerned, it has not merely imperilled as it might have in other parts of the country, it has torn up by the root such friendly understanding as existed between the Hindu and the Muslim. Then it has been the indirect occasion of manifesting to the world how some of our people, when excited by angry passions, can be guilty of acts of cruelty and barbarity, scarcely compatible with that character for spirituality which we wish to establish amongst the nations of the world, scarcely compatible with the contribution which so many patriotic sons of India desire to make to the story of human civilization. Then again, strange as it may appear, it has enormously increased such slave mentality as existed before it in this country. It has demonstrated that our common people are lacking in the practical sense and political instinct which might protect them against any crude, and ill-balanced propaganda. Likewise it has manifested on a scale that I have never seen before the disparity between profession and practice (hear, hear) which one occasionally sees in political matters, but which became palpable in the Non-Co-operation

programme for the first time; witness the boycott of schools and colleges and courts and councils, acclaimed by tens of thousands of people, which was followed, happily enough from my point of view, but unhappily from the point of view of national character, by singularly little performance. Then it has produced amongst the people at large a curious psychology. You now have people, young and old, villagers and townsmen, men and women, falling into the habit of excessive pessimism in their estimate of things; and on every occasion when they wish to show their dissatisfaction they show it by saying that they must boycott, they must withdraw, they must non-co operate, they must do nothing, in fact a doctrine which cannot be described as anything else than a translation into our political life of the old Buddhist doctrine of perfect negation, to detach yourself from life by doing as little as possible, by doing nothing and getting away and further away from Karma. That is the spirit which is brought amongst us to-day, and I do not think it makes an addition to our national character of promises much vigorous effort for our future. Then it has spread a spirit of revolt and undermined those foundations, which wise people are careful to instil and foster, of obedience to law and order. Above all my complaint against the movement is this that, starting with the idea of undeniable grievances from which the people suffered and for which the Government is responsible, professing to hit the Government and save the people, it has throughout

and every time hit the people more and more (applause), much like an ignorant mother who finding her child beaten by her neighbours brings it home and belabours it still more saying, "Why did you move out of your place? Take this and this and this."

That, gentlemen, is putting the balance right, what the Non-Co-operation movement has brought the people to. If we are to progress safely and surely in the future, it is our duty apart from blaming anybody, it is our duty to see that nothing occurs in the political atmosphere of which the initiative may be with the Government or with you or me or anybody, that nothing occurs, that nothing is done in any quarter which may threaten the revival of an activity of this sort. Our duty then is to see, as I said before, how to deepen and confirm and fortify from all sides that outward peace which we see established, until it should become real and lasting peace.

Now anybody may see at once you cannot have peace in the country by any means so long as there is any acute grievance. Following the old principle of Bacon, to cure sedition you have to remove the matter of sedition. Now I am sorry to think that this simple prescription is by no means so easy of operation as it appears. I wish it were possible for you and for me by a resolution duly recorded here to dissipate these grievances. But it is not. We are unhappily living in conditions when grievances have a way of fortifying themselves, when vested interests

grow around them with the enormous facilities for propaganda for evil as well as for good, and you have the curious spectacle of generations of effort being required before a grievance acknowledged on all sides could be removed.

I will give you one or two instances. What could be a longer or a more real grievance than the exclusion of our capable young lads from office in the military ranks? In our previous history such a thing has not been known. In the history of other empires such a thing is not known but in the history of the British Empire it is a sore rankling, a festering evil. How often have we protested against it? How often have authorities admitted that it was a grievance, that it was a grievance that must be removed and that it would sooner or later be removed? It is now five years since a solemn pronouncement was made by Imperial authorities that that grievance shall not be hereafter? Still the first serious step has to be taken towards the removal of it. The fact is, ladies and gentlemen, if you will permit me to remind you of a hard fact, however unpleasant it may be, that there are such things as vested interests and when they grow round an evil, whether it is in India or elsewhere, they take long to remove. They cause so much tribulation, they make us pass for long periods through the valley of humiliation and bitterness, but to lose heart is not the way of vigorous people. We believe at last that this great grievance is now really on the eve of removal. It will take time to accom-

plish ; but surely, as I am speaking to you from this platform, even this grievance, which has baffled our efforts for a generation, is at least on the way to redress.

. Then take such a simple matter in our own society as widow-remarriage. How much effort have we put into it? How many hearts have suffered and probably been broken? How many lives have been married? How often have audiences been moved to tears and to solemn promises for removing it in the future and yet those enthusiastic audiences have gone back to their usual environments and felt that the callousness that was in the air overpowered them. The anguish of the heart for the moment is there, we feel it for the time and then forget even the great promises that we made; and yet we must admit that a great deal has been done even in this slow-moving country to remove the widow-remarriage grievance. I know that enthusiastic advocates of this cause who will scarcely consent to be satisfied with the rate of progress. Nevertheless the apostles, whose advocacy has enshrined this cause in our hearts, have not lost hope and they go on from year to year, toiling steadily upward maintained and upheld by the thought that good work in this direction as in any other will never be totally wasted.

I wish it were in our power to compel Government by the force of public opinion not merely to redress the grievances that lacerate our hearts already

but to see that in the near future no new grievance, such as the Rowlatt Act, is manufactured afresh. The worst of this state of things is that when repression puts down a great movement like Non-Co-operation, it employs a weapon naturally called terrorism, makes use of all the repressive weapons in the armoury of the law and creates in the innocent as well as guilty hearts, amongst honest and patriotic workers as amongst the reverse, it plants in the hearts of every body, the feeling that the time is not opportune for good or well-sustained effort in the public cause. Public life falls below its usual level, everyone seems to be seized with a fit which looks like apathy but really amounts to complete and entire hatred of things as they are. The Government and its agents, having for the moment accomplished their task, are likely to mistake this apathy and indifference and to construe it into feelings of gratification or contentment or satisfaction. Too often have district officers and others, whose duty it is to watch things, reported that on such occasions the movement of rebellion has been got under, people are satisfied once more and that the district is on its even way of progress. The truth however is that there is no real satisfaction, people are embittered and soured, the memory of things, of wasted efforts, of bitter humiliation, of indignities undeservedly suffered, rankles in their hearts. For a year or five years or ten years it may be that nothing is visible above, but the undercurrent of dissatisfaction, of a brooding resentment against

the powers that be, is constantly at work and when again there comes up such a national movement, it is bound to start at a very high level to draw upon all these, for the moment unobserved, forces of disorder or racial bitterness, until Government will find itself face to face with a task far greater than they ever had of a similar nature. I have never known such profound distrust of Government as there is to-day (hear, hear), such absolute lack of faith in their sincerity, such a rooted tendency to put aside all their pledges and promises and declarations of intentions as of no value whatever. (A voice; "it is true".) So far as this feeling goes, I know it for a fact and I mention it with great grief, that very good people (by "good" I mean good-natured, good-hearted people) have gone so far as to say that he who takes tea with an Englishman is a traitor (laughter), that he who maintains social amenities with the foreigner is one whose game is to betray his country at a favourable opportunity. When such is the case and all that people want is proof, no more by word, no more by declaration or resolution on paper, but proof by action that Government really intend to use the Reform Act to the advantage of the people (hear, hear), that they mean to pay every farthing of the bill, when proof of that kind is wanted, a clear duty rests on all who wield authority, from the Viceroy downwards, that night and day they interpret the provisions of the Government of India Act generously and liberally, that they how that they are always moving forward, never

keeping the country back, that, for example, if it is a matter of filling appointments, to mention one instance only, they lose no opportunity, for example, of appointing to such posts as Secretaries or Under-Secretaries—posts hitherto reserved mainly for Europeans, Indians of sufficient standing and good reputation. I know of nothing which will so effectively give an indication of the reality of Government's intentions as for example in some of the major provinces, the appointment of an Indian at the next vacancy to the office of Director of Public Instruction. We have a Minister of Education to-day in the person of Mr. Paranjpye here, if I could put him in the witness-box (laughter) and ask him to tell me honestly whether he would not feel his hands strengthened by an Indian Director of Public Instruction of his own choice (applause), I know what answer he would give.

Now, I come to a question of the very greatest importance, the road to peace, that peace of the heart to which I referred, the road to peace is by no means easy. It is blocked by such a serious thing as the imprisonment, for various acts and for various terms, of something like 20,000 of our people. Several of them young and immature, led into the ways of disorder, doubtless under a mistaken sense of patriotism, but young people ardent, eager, animated by unselfish ideas. This is causing feelings of acute distress all over the country. No one realizes that more than I do. It is impossible to conceive of people falling into their normal ways in political and

other matters, untill something is done to reduce this great volume of distress in the whole country. And is it impossible? I do not think by any means. You of Bombay, I understand, have no great complaint to make of the way in which the rebellious forms of Non Co-operation were dealt with in your province. I will not therefore ask you from personal experience to endorse the remark that I now make, but I can tell you from the experience of other provinces like the United Provinces and Bengal and, to some extent, of my own province of Madras. There, it would appear, I have heard such a funny thing as this has taken place that when certain Samitis or volunteer associations had five members marched to prison for belonging to them, others in batches came forward and did nothing but announce that they belonged to these proclaimed associations and without further ado, so I understand, they were put on the lists as belonging to those Samitis and removed to jail. (Hear, hear.) Now that kind of thing need not be at all. It is a gratuitous addition to the sufferings of the people. And I think the sooner the people who were marched to gaol merely for technical offences of that kind, for offences which they committed, rather for the fun of it than for anything else, the sooner they are let off the better, I think, for society. And so, a little later, people whose offences might be a little more grave may have their cases considered and so on, until in no long course of time we can reduce very considerably the number of those who

for activities of a disorderly nature against the community must continue to be deprived of their liberty.

But the mind of India will refuse to rest satisfied if nothing was done in the constitutional direction almost immediately. Now let me, ladies and gentlemen, beseech your patience a little if I dwell at rather wearisome length on this aspect of the question, namely, further advance of a constitutional character. That such an attempt should be made I am the last person to deny. I recognize the immediate necessity of some such grant of extended power, but, ladies and gentlemen, I lay great emphasis on the necessity of so conducting this effort of ours that we get all the chances in our favour and not leave any against us if possible. Above all things I dread the consequences in the present state of another disappointment, as India cannot have another big defeat in the constitutional direction; everything should be done to make the attempt successful so far as endeavours on this side can be made.

Now there are three ways in which further constitutional advance may be accomplished. They differ somewhat in character and it behoves me to put them to you one after another. The first that I have heard from a high authority indeed—I cannot, however, unfortunately be more particular—the first that I have heard is this, that without the people making a great demand either by deputation or by memorial or in other understood ways, that without the people making any

demand the Imperial authorities of Great Britain must be persuaded on their own initiative to bring in a Bill for the grant to India of immediate provincial autonomy. In other words people of India should have an unsolicited boon. Now if such a thing could happen no one of us will rejoice—less than another—Let me put it that way! But, I ask, is that possible? You or I ought to have no part or lot in the manipulation of it, we are only to wait while things are moving behind the screen, we have only to wait for the fruition of that attempt which is supposed to be made behind the screen, which you do not initiate or advance in any of its stages, but for which you have got to wait right through like a poor helpless young bird waiting for food from the beak of its mother. Is that possible for us? Is it an attitude which we can at all adopt? Now above all it strikes me that there is not within the British Isles any statesman of such a vast and unquestioned authority that if he were of his own accord to propose Provincial Autonomy or Dominion Status to India, he could really persuade either the Cabinet or the Imperial Parliament to sanction it. I know no one with so big a heart in the first place and assuming there was such a person, I do not know that he would command the almost divine authority which is necessary for him to follow it up. Such a superman democracy does not produce.

The next thing is this. Some people say, "Let us by our own efforts try and procure this further

advance." I am not aware of anyone who asks for any further stages less advanced than provincial autonomy ; all of us, I take it, including the most backward Liberals, are agreed that there should be only one further step in this direction and that we should get provincial autonomy at one stroke. People say, why should not India unite together and make one tremendous effort at once and straightway obtain this consummation ? I think a proposal somewhat of that kind was brought forward and passed at the Allahabad meeting of the All-India Liberal Federation a few months ago. Many things have happened since the date of that resolution I am not sure that a thing of that kind is practicable. Mind you I do not say I am going to wait for further proof of our fitness. I am only asking you to consider the practicability of this proposal. Well, it appears to me that since we passed that resolution at Allahabad, the boycott of the Prince of Wales assumed a sinister aspect, to put it no more offensively, and I can tell you from personal knowledge that that unfortunate move on the part of our Non-Co-operationist friends has estranged the sympathies of a good section even of our friends in Great Britain. It is not a thing for which I am responsible, it is not a thing for which the Liberal Party are responsible. I am merely bringing you news of a state of things existing there. England herself is on the eve probably of a General Election, the trouble in Ireland seems to be more acute than ever, and Mr. Lloyd George finds Genoa

a bigger morsel than he had thought it to be. If in the near future there should be a General Election, the chances of India's constitutional advance being made an issue on the election platform, you know, are very remote. The time therefore is not particularly propitious for the success of a big effort such as we might perhaps be induced to make. It is none of our doing, even Providence can only deal with the material already before it, the forces are there and we can only manipulate them; and if it is not possible for us to attain success, no blame attaches to us, it only means a slight postponement of our effort.

And now I will mention what may be a somewhat more elaborate method of approaching this problem, a method compatible with the existing constitution, a method the success of which I should say is a little less uncertain (I will not put it higher) than the success of the alternative methods that I have just mentioned. That is the method of working the whole thing up through our electorates and through the legislatures which are the creatures of those electorates. The Englishman is a slave of his political constitution. He may wish to change it, he may wish even to revolutionise it, but his instinct always is to work the change or to bring about the revolution only through that constitution. He will not stand outside, as some of our friends would, and say he will bend, break or demolish it or he will send it to the very Satan from whom it had its origin.

That is not his way of doing things. If he understands that we are attempting to use in the regular way the constitution with which the Government of India Act has endowed us, he will then see it is a movement to which he is bound to listen. What takes place when you want a tremendous upheaval of your constitution? You have got first of all to charge your legislatures with a mandate from the electorate. We are not very far from an election. The Councils are in the second year of their existence. Next year by this time the air will ring with the appeals of candidates to their electorates. Then I know nothing more sure than this, that the best way of educating your electorate (upon which our Chairman of the Reception Committee laid such just stress in his address) that there is no surer, no better way of educating your electorate than of going to them and talking about the necessity of our attaining provincial autonomy at one stroke. If people are returned on such a platform, if our legislatures in Bombay and in Madras and in Bengal and the other provinces are filled with candidates whose election had been secured on promises of provincial autonomy, then the legislatures so brought into existence cannot turn their back on duties so solemnly assumed. The legislatures are bound to act so as to get provincial autonomy, and then my plan would be for each such legislature to elect a few people to choose men of ripest experience and most sober judgment and not necessarily those who make the most attractive promises or who give

utterance to the most unrestrained sentiments. A convention so formed from the legislatures to which the Imperial legislature also contributed its quota, could then be charged with the duty of framing a new constitution for India on the basis of the present one without the necessity of scrapping it, so that when it did produce a scheme it would represent the best wisdom and statesmanship available in India. That scheme would then be published for general information and criticism ; perhaps the various legislatures will be seized of it and when it came out of this ordeal, it would really be a good scheme, fitting in so admirably with the constitution that we already possess, that it would stand every chance of being accepted as practicable and proper and wise. Suppose further the Legislative Assembly and the Council of State acting together chose a deputation consisting, say, of six men or eight men or ten men, they should be men whose names might command influence in the English Parliament. Suppose they went with a scheme of that kind ; I know of no statesman in England, I know of no political body of any importance in England who would treat their representation either lightly or contemptuously. And this process need not take such a long time as some people seem to think. The next Council will come into office in the beginning of 1924. By the end of that year nearly the whole of these arrangements may be completed and our deputation may wait on the Imperial Parliament in 1925. And supposing the

Bill took six or seven months to get through as a Bill generally does, still we should see our new Constitution in 1926. Is that such a long time to wait?

Now, ladies and gentlemen, notwithstanding what I say, some of you may be thinking of some better way of reaching our goal, and if in the course of your deliberations to-day and to-morrow you should hit upon some plan which promises speedier success, be assured that I shall have no compunction whatever in abandoning mine and embracing yours.

Then I will refer to what people are sometimes fond of thrusting in our face, the great obstacle produced by the ten-year clause in the Government of India Act. Luckily it has been interpreted in a rather loose way and I have known people of authority maintain in the Imperial Parliament that that does not preclude us at all from taking a further step in the interval. I may tell you that in my various addresses and interviews in England I have pressed that view. I have begged them for the sake of India and for the sake of England not to dwell with pedantic exactitude on that period of ten years. I have told them that to wait longer than is absolutely necessary would be to invite disaster in India, that the wise course would be to anticipate by as many years as possible the consummation of the Constitution of which the Government of India Act is the first instalment, and if I may judge at all the signs I can give you hope that you will find a great deal

of sympathy and support in your desire to hasten the attainment of this consummation.

Now this matter is not going to be pressed merely as a concession to the impatient people in India. If I understand things aright it is possible to reinforce our demand by many arguments from the side of administrative convenience. You may all remember that the principle of diarchy was accepted by us under a sense of necessity. The other day Lord Chelmsford actually described the circumstances which made him and Mr. Montagu adopt this device. He spoke the truth without doubt, but then we who represented the people of India before the Select Committee of Parliament took every care that the principle of diarchy should be acceptable only if it was watered down and filtered so much that the harshness of duality was not left, and the machinery would for most purposes function almost as if it was a unitary government. I quite remember the struggle we had. It is not necessary now to review it. But I will only point out that this system of diarchy worked best in those provinces of India—I am not sure that Bombay would be included amongst them—the system of diarchy worked best in those provinces of India where the safeguards and the correctives upon which we insisted were most scrupulously observed, where the Governor took care on all important matters to summon his executive councils and ministers together, where he took care that the resolutions of the Legislative Council on either

reserved or transferred subjects were treated more or less on the same footing of respectful attention as where the Governor, before taking action for instance, of a drastic character in order to proclaim say, a Samiti or an arrest of a person of importance—it is in cases where the Governor summoned the two halves together and made the public understand that every important action was the action of a unified government and not of a Governor acting in two separate compartments—it is where that condition prevailed that diarchy worked with great success. In some places Governors, carried away by consciousness of their own abilities, did not bring the two halves of government together as often as they should have done. The result was, I think, a little discord.

Moreover there was one thing above all which drew the harsh character of this dual government out and exhibited it in most glaring forms, and that was the visit of the Prince of Wales. I do not think that there is anyone here who desired it most enthusiastically at this particular time—not certainly I—I counselled against the visit as long as I could—but the visit came and what happened? When the boycott of that visit was proclaimed by the Non-Co-operators, the result was that Government, in order to make it a success against this opposition, had to use all the arms in their control, they used all the repressive laws they could think of. I understand section 144 was being illegitimately used for this purpose, but

whether or no that was the case, the fact came out that for the exercise of their repressive functions on this large and drastic and very disturbing scale, Government in several provinces relied not on the usual practice of bringing the two halves of government together and taking their consent, but acted on their own behalf, that is on behalf of the executive part of the administration, with the result that even the Liberal public, even the Moderate party, withheld its co-operation with Government in all that went to maintain law and order (hear, hear) for which they had previously pledged their word; they said, "this is not a thing that we can support," thus bringing into prominent relief that dual feature of diarchy against which from the very first we had strenuously protested. I am mentioning this rather elaborately for the purpose of showing that we have a very good argument at our disposal that through the action of Government itself the bad nature of diarchy has been brought out and Government in that respect functioned in complete isolation from every section of opinion in India, co-operationist as well as non-co-operatists. Again it is difficult for our legislatures to maintain two different attitudes, one attitude towards the reserved subjects and one attitude towards the transferred subjects, and I have heard from Ministers—not those that happen to sit here (laughter)—complaints about the imperfect control—to put it euphemistically—that they are able to exercise over their higher officers.

Besides, there is one great danger in over-straining this system of diarchy. That danger is this: you all know how in English history the House of Commons obtained more and more power over regions at first kept from its jurisdiction by the exercise of its financial control. When anything not within its precise scope but still grossly repugnant to its sense of propriety occurred, the House of Commons used its financial power in order to extend its jurisdiction. So should we in India. That idea has not yet occurred to our people, but there could not long be many bitter complaints without there being a resort to the common expedient of denying supplies. The constitutional remedy is in our hands. It will produce, if the Government continues this system for a long time, it will produce deadlocks—it will produce denial of budgetary supplies with a dislocation of administrative machinery, from which Government and people alike stand to suffer. Now, it appears to me that a case of that kind, reinforced from the side of those who have an inside knowledge of its working, from those who have taken pension after being Executive Councillors for example, from those who have held office for the full period of Ministers or have been driven out of them by the constitutional exercise of the legislatures' undoubted powers, it is when people of that kind throw in their wisdom and experience and enable us to construct a case, that that case will really be unanswerable. (Applause.) That takes a little time,

we must wait till Mr. Paranjpye (laughter) retires.

Now, I have got a word to say about the Central Government. I am afraid I have not much time in which to elaborate my views about the Central Government. The matter is so important and I happen to hold a certain view which I think I am in duty bound as a member of the Liberal Party to place before this assembled meeting of the Federation. May I have that indulgence? (Voices: Go on, go on) I was one of those who, when in England, pressed with the greatest insistence on the introduction of a certain element of responsibility; and I very much wished at that time that the Government had yielded to our wishes and placed both the Imperial and the Provincial governments on a more or less parallel footing. Do I press it now with equal persistency? I did until some time ago, and if I do not do so now, you are entitled to know why. It may be I am right, it may be I am wrong, I am still open to conviction in that matter and, as in several others, I will defer to your collective and wiser judgment if you should differ from me. My change of view is of very recent origin and one of its causes I shall presently explain. This responsibility is really what is called the power of the legislature to dismiss a Minister when that Minister forfeits its confidence. We have this element of responsibility in the provinces. Have we used it there? You may say, "We have been in existence only for a year

and a half and you do not expect our efficient Ministers to incur displeasure to such an extent that we should dismiss them." (Laughter). I do not wish it by any means. But I have read of proceedings in which Ministers were defeated by the legislatures. Did they resign? Did the legislatures insist on their undoubted right of asking them to resign? They did not. Whether this took place in every Council or not, I do not know, but it did happen once or twice at least, in the Madras Council. The fact of the matter is that there is a wise instinct in our people—I applaud it—I do not regret it, I am only putting it as a poser just to perplex you for a minute, to make you fall in with the suggestion I propose to make. People have a wise instinct. They know that the first Ministers have exceptional difficulties to contend with and the success of the Reform Scheme to which the Liberal Party is pledged above all things, depends on the Ministers having every opportunity with their support of doing a good stroke of work or two for their country. Therefore they sustained them in office and gave them extended opportunities, even although in one or two matters they might have incurred their displeasure, that is a healthy instinct with which I do not quarrel in the least, but there is one condition on which alone you can exercise this responsibility, and that is that parties in the legislature should be well formed so that the Minister may know whom he can rely on at a juncture. Where the Minister

does not know that he has a regular, trustworthy following consisting of so and so, A, B, C, where the Minister does not feel an obligation to any section or any group in the legislature, the legislature is devoid of the moral authority of asking him to resign (hear, hear). But if it did not render him consistent, uniform support it is no business of theirs to ask him to resign. How was he to know the mind of his legislature? So the argument would run backward and forward. I am only mentioning the argument, so that because we have responsibility in a legislature it is not as though we were going to use it in order to dismiss the Minister. It is therefore at present merely an academical question. But I have a further misgiving. At the time that this constitution was started you will please remember that one of the postulates was that while we had responsibility in the provinces, so far as the Central Government was concerned, it was still to be paramount, the wishes of the legislature were to count for little. They may be heeded, they may be respected, but they would not be followed. And the Select Committee, before whom we gave evidence, went to the length of adding a special paragraph in which they said that they meant the extraordinary power of the Viceroy and the Governor-General and his Council to be used for the purpose of every day administration to be kept in their hands, not as reserve power which might come into operation some time but used for everyday

purposes. Now in the actual working during these eighteen months, my friends Sir Dinsha Wacha and others will endorse the remark, Government has not been using this as a weapon of every day administration. They have allowed it even in highly provocative conditions to lie dormant. More, the Viceroy made it known, I believe, that he would not use this weapon.

(The Honourable Mr. Lalubhai Samaldas: Except as regards non-votable items.)

That is a matter of legal opinion. The Viceroy has always exercised his discretion in favour of extending the power of the legislature. The system therefore of no responsibility in the Central Government has had this extraordinary result, that instead of confining the power of the Legislative Assembly to one item or two as it would have been if we have had responsibility, our powers are the same over the whole range of the functions of the Central Government. Now if we have had a differentiation between certain spheres in which the legislature is supreme with a Minister to control and certain other spheres where the Minister is not to be supreme, then I am afraid we might not have full control except over a department or two. Now this is a development which I have not drawn from my ingenuity. This is an inference which has been drawn in very influential quarters in England where our constitution, young as it is, is being studied with attention, and I may add, with sympathy. I am not therefore, ladies and

gentlemen, so very enthusiastic as I used to be about the demand for a certain element of responsibility in the Central Government. The reason is that I rather fear that we might lose more than we gain by this change. But whether this argument of mine appeals to you or not I am not sure. But for the moment I am only concerned with laying before you candidly my own view. I have already given you the promise at the outset that I should consider myself bound in ordinary cases by your superior wisdom at the end.

Now I am afraid I have kept you much too long. There are one or two matters which I intended to dwell upon, but I think it is not fair to tax your patience any further.

Now let me conclude with one word of earnest appeal. Ladies and gentlemen, we all belong to the Liberal party, or the Moderate, or if you may say so, the reasonable party in this country. (Hear, hear.) We wish to act with the least disturbance anywhere. We want to push along the lines, if possible, of least resistance. We know—do not we?—that there are no angels under the sun—neither in India, nor in England. While we are keenly pursuing our interests compatibly with the interests of the rest of the world, so are they the people of England pursuing their interests compatibly with those of the rest of the world. I do not attribute to them any virtues intrinsically superior to those that we possess. I do not proceed in this matter

of political emancipation of India in the faith that we have only to prove our case and our progress will be secured. I have no such faith. I always knew that we should have enormous difficulties from vested interests in England, that every step of our progress will be contested, and contested hotly, and perhaps unfairly too. We are quite prepared for it. Otherwise we should not deserve the name of a party. If we believe that our path would be perfectly smooth and easy we should be like babes newly born into the world. Why do I mention this elementary fact? In order to ask your sympathetic attention to that phase of the relation between Englishmen and Indians which is apt sometimes to be laid aside in the heat of controversy. Englishmen have duties to us as we have duties to them. Rather let me put in this way, that England in the abstract has duties to India in the abstract, as there are duties proceeding in the contrary direction. Now these duties sometimes cross each other and they have got to be adjusted, they have got to be reconciled. We always ask that our motives should be understood at their best and noblest and we are bound in return to understand the motives on the other side similarly. We ask for confidence and trust; we are bound to return the confidence and trust. We ask that our failings should be overlooked, we ask that our crudities and our inexperience may be tolerated with a sympathetic understanding and we should be enabled to surmount

them, to correct them, to grow out of them. Englishmen are not so perfect that they have not similar crudities and selfishness and lower aspects of character out of which it is our duty to help them to grow. In some matters they are unwilling to relax their hold in time. They are not willing to let it go one moment sooner than may be absolutely necessary. Sometimes in the enthusiasm of righteousness, when some wave of humanitarian feeling carries them away, their best spokesmen indulge in the finest sentiments of international morality. Parliament, perhaps in the preamble and provisions of its Acts, employs language calculated to produce the impression that Englishmen are, from breakfast till dinner, nothing but angels. (Laughter.) They answer to a high impulse, to a noble impulse which comes to them in rare moments. Well it were for them and for us if these moments were more frequent, if between them instead of continual breaks there were one golden chain unbroken. Can we help in bringing about that state of things? I think we can. By patience, by strenuously fighting our cause, by employing every argument that experience and wisdom can urge, by continually appealing to their higher nature we can make these moments more frequent and more continuous and therefore more benevolently operative for the general benefit of the human race. Is it an impossible task for us? We who propose to teach the rest of the world all that there is in our spiritual treasures; we who propose to revivify the Eastern

morality and make it overspread the whole earth ; shall we give up the task ? In this we are quite prepared to take a lesson from the Non-co-operationist, for what is the gospel of Non-co-operation ? What is the basis of its activity ? By suffering, by inflicting it on himself, by leaving the other side to trample on himself and to use him as chattel, by submitting to this with the divinity of resignation, the Non-co-operator says he will convert the tyrant, first into a commiserator, then into a penitent and then into an ameliorator and finally into a loving brother. (Applause.) What is open to the Non-co-operator is, I venture to think, also open to us, and this international contact between England and India should be made by conscious efforts on our part to subserve our purpose in the first instance but to subserve also other and more exalted purposes. (Loud applause.)

Speech at the Simla Banquet.

[On the eve of Mr. Sastri's departure to the Dominions he was entertained at a farewell dinner at the Viceregal Lodge, Simla on May 12, 1922. H. E. the Viceroy, in his speech eulogising the services of Mr. Sastri read the following message from Lord Peel, the Secretary of State for India.]

“ Before you depart for Australia, New Zealand and Canada, at the invitations of the Governments of those Dominions, as a representative of the Government of India, I wish to take the opportunity of expressing my sense of high importance of your mission for India and the Empire.. The eloquence and the cogency of your appeals were largely instrumental in the success achieved by the representatives of India at the Premiers' Conference last year, which places on record a resolution recognising the rights of citizenship of Indians lawfully domiciled in other parts of the Empire. The ready acceptance of that resolution by the Empire Ministers of the Great Dominions which you will visit is a signal proof of the new status of equal partnership won by India through her efforts and sacrifices during the War in the Councils of the British Commonwealth of nations. It will now

be your task to extend and quicken the spirit of harmony and good will, to consult with leaders of political thought in the Dominions and their constituent states and provinces as to the best means and methods of giving effect to the objects of the resolution, and to bring home to their peoples the evidence of India's worthiness of her new status and her consciousness of common ideals and higher interests, which she shares with them as an equal partner in the British Commonwealth of nations. No one better qualified than you could have been chosen to undertake this difficult and important mission, in which I am confident you will achieve the greatest possible measure of success. You carry with you my most cordial good wishes."

His Excellency continued :—

"I shall not allude at length to my Right Hon'ble friend's past services to India and the Empire; for I feel assured that you will agree with me in holding that these services are already recognised as an important page in the history and that the chronicle of his activities will be read by future generations in India as marking an important step of progress in the relations between the British Government and India, and in the development of India's place in the greatest Empire in the world.

The part he, together with his colleague the Maharao of Cutch, played at the meetings of the

Imperial Conference in London and of the League of Nations at Geneva is already well known. Not content as he might have been to have rested upon his labours, my Right Hon'ble friend then proceeded as the representative of India to the historic Washington Conference. Our honoured guest of to-night has made us proud of him to whom we entrusted the heavy responsibility of placing India's interests before those high tribunals, and I do not overstate the case when I assert that his bearing in these weighty conferences, his high character and his skill in argument, and eloquence in expression, have produced an effect on the representatives of our Empire, and on those of other nations, which has markedly enhanced the good name of India and elevated the reputation of her people."

Then advertng to the genesis of his mission to the Dominions the Viceroy said :—

"It has now been decided that my Right Hon. friend will proceed alone and undertake this difficult task single-handed. He might well quail before the burden he proposed to lift, but he is undeterred by the difficulties of his past experience. His tact and the strength of his purpose inspire me to think that these delicate negotiations are in the safest of hands. We must not however be disappointed if they do not produce immediately the results we seek ; for in these political negotiations, patience is a great

virtue. We must be patient. We have ground for trust; for I am confident that the seed Mr. Sastri sows will in the fullness of time bear the harvest which should completely satisfy our legitimate hopes."

In acknowledging the toast Mr. Sastri made the following speech :—

"**Y**OUR Excellency, your Highness, Ladies and Gentlemen,—I feel a proud man to-day in many ways, but I also ask you to see in me a man in the uttermost confusion, not able to find words in which to express the feelings with which his heart is charged. I am, as you may expect, in profound gratitude to His Excellency for the way in which he has presented me to this great assembly. I must, in the first instance, ask His Excellency most respectfully to convey to His Majesty's Secretary of State for India my high sense of appreciation and gratitude for the felicitously phrased message which he has been pleased to send me.

Ladies and Gentlemen, believe me, I did not expect in the least to be the recipient of the eulogy that it has pleased His Excellency the Viceroy, to pronounce to-night. I hardly know in what terms suitably to acknowledge my debt. I can only begin by saying that if I have succeeded to any extent in the discharge of the high duties that the Government of India entrusted to me, it is largely due to the fact that everywhere the Government of India is held in high respect and any agent of that Government is

bound to receive respectful attention. In spite of what certain people may say, I found the fullest recognition of the importance of the Indian Government and the great prestige which it commands in the Councils, not only of the Empire but of the world.

Whether it was so long years ago or now, I do not pretend to be able to say, but at the present moment, it is by no means an exaggeration to say that an Indian travelling abroad and charged by the Government of India with any message is assured of a most earnest and respectful hearing.

I have a word to say to this great assembly in recognition of the services which at Washington, Mr. Corbett of the Indian Civil Service, Colonel Wigram of His Majesty's Forces, and my Secretary, Mr. Bajpai, rendered to the Government of India. My duties were greatly lightened by their assistance. Their devotion to the cause of India and their special knowledge of the subjects that came under review were beyond praise.

GOVERNMENT'S SECURITY.

Your Excellency, people in India swayed by abnormal considerations in the past few years, have failed to take account of these circumstances. Lord Chelmsford in nominating me, as the representative of his Government to the Imperial Conference, ventured on a great departure from the traditions of our Government. He chose a non-official, although a member of his Legislature, for the first time to

represent the Government in the Imperial Councils. It was not understood at the time, but I take leave to say that that appointment would not have been possible but for the completeness with which the Government of India had during the last few years identified themselves with the best thoughts and aspirations of the people of India, as regards their status abroad and in International Councils. I tried to remember how a few years ago nothing was more noticeable than the violent feelings which agitated the people of India with regard to their status in the Dominions and elsewhere, and the somewhat tepid manner in which on their behalf, representations used to be made not only by the Government of India but by the various local Governments as well. That state of things is long past and now everyone, even though he be a Non-Co-operator, will feel bound in justice and in truth to acknowledge that, if there had been a truly national Government with a national personnel, the representations made on behalf of Indians, either at the seat of the Empire or in the International Councils, could not have been more forcible, or more entirely consonant with the wishes of the community. Then, too, some amount of surprise was felt, and, I think, adverse ignorant criticism was passed on the circumstances to which His Excellency referred, that in this delicate matter of the treatment of Indians in our Dominions, the Imperial Government had, as it were—I am putting it in the way of a critic—washed its hands clean of

the business and retired, leaving the Indian Government to fight its case as it might with the various Dominions concerned. It was rather different on the part of the Imperial Government. I take it and I hope that my countrymen in India will come to realise it more and more, that the Imperial Government recognised that perhaps the intercession of a Government, that was in a position more or less to lay down, to dictate, to express itself, as it were, from a superior pedestal was not welcomed by the fully grown Dominions, and it would be a graceful recognition of the full autonomy of the Dominions on the one hand and likewise of an admission that India had risen to Dominions Status on the other.

It was, I think, this feeling rather than any other that dictated the policy which has now been responsible for my proceeding as a representative direct of the Government of India to conduct negotiations on these matters with the Government of the various Dominions. I think success is much more assured in this way of approach than it might have been if we had always spoken through, and our case had been transmitted direct by the Imperial Government.

THE DOMINIONS' SYMPATHY

I must acknowledge on my part the very great help and sympathy, I received at the deliberations of the Imperial Conference from the Premiers of the various Dominions, with one notable exception, which, I daresay, is present in the minds of you all. The statement of the case for Indians received the most

careful attention. The Premiers were glad to find out our point of view and when they found it out and likewise recognised that it was compatible with their inmost wishes, I received every encouragement from them and promises of support in case a deputation from India were willing to proceed to the various localities and to present India's case there. It was to me a matter of the greatest pleasure to find that India was so well received by the Premiers, but let me assure you, Ladies and Gentlemen, that the success of our cause and the passing of that resolution at the Imperial Conference would not have been possible, were it not for the forceful, enthusiastic and eloquent advocacy of our cause by the Premier of Great Britain himself. Mr. Lloyd George found it necessary at the last moment to interpose his authority and his great eloquence on behalf of India. More than anything else, it was the few words that he said in the end in favour of India's cause that succeeded in bringing about the passing of that resolution. It is, therefore, primarily at the hands of the Imperial Cabinet that we had to look for the carrying out in full of the terms and purposes of that resolution. In other words, ladies and gentlemen, in no spirit of controversy, but in the spirit of India's best interests, I put it to you that that resolution is going to be tested not so much by the results of the mission into the Dominions, as by what takes place as regards Kenya and Uganda. I am full of apprehension at what might happen in case an adverse decision

would be pronounced rather hastily by the Imperial Cabinet regarding the interests of Indians in these Crown Colonies. I hope nothing will happen any way to prove that my apprehension is at all well founded, and I am in the fullest hope that at the last moment when the decision comes to be taken the larger, nobler and the higher view will be taken and India's views and ambitions fully satisfied.

It will not do for me, however, to hide from you or myself the possibility that my hands might be a little weakened in the Dominions, when I am speaking on behalf of Indians there, by any adverse treatment of Indians in the Colonies of Kenya and Uganda, where not a large loyal legislature, nor unsympathetic parliaments but the authorities of Whitehall are themselves concerned.

PERSONAL CRITICS

His Excellency was also pleased to refer to my critics. I have a great many of them and I rejoice that they should pay so much attention to so obscure an individual. I have tried in more than one place to present the true aspect of my forthcoming tour. I have tried to explain how this resolution arose and how in consequence of it, I am being deputed by the Government of India. Much of the misrepresentation has been dispelled, I am glad to say, but as it happens in all these cases, there is a good deal of residue left which it is impossible to clear away. Part of the residue doubtless relates to my personality and that need not concern anybody excepting myself, but

I am bound to point out that a good part of this residue is likewise due to that brooding dissatisfaction which the Non-Co-operation movement has left behind. I am taking it as of the past; I hope it is. As one of its most undesirable consequences, too many of my friends, too many of my countrymen, seem to think that the steps that we have taken in acquiring Dominion status, whether at London or at Geneva, or at Washington, and now in Geneva are but so many pebbles thrown at us by a designing bureaucracy by which our political inaptitude is constantly tripped and betrayed. They seem to think that some of us who belong to what is called the Liberal party and who are trying, as far as possible, to improve negotiations with Government are victims of a great self-deception that what is called our equal partnership in the Britannic Commonwealth of Nations usually classed by Mr. Lloyd George as "the free Commonwealth that our equal partnership in that orbit, of "Free Nations," is but a delusion and a snare.

TRUTH OF THE MATTER

Ladies and Gentlemen, you will permit me to take a few minutes of your time in describing what I consider to be the truth of the matter, which is entirely forgotten by the somewhat hasty and unthinking critics in India. This Britannic Commonwealth of Nations is not always best understood by the Englishmen themselves. Perhaps it is necessary not to be an Englishman so as to feel the great influence

of this Commonwealth and to feel also its benevolence in full. Somehow or other I have an unquenchable faith in the future of this Commonwealth. I have been criticised every now and then for referring in an excess of enthusiasm to the ideals of the British Empire, but still I remain imperturbable. I belong to the Servants of India Society, of which the basic article is the belief that the connection of India with England is somehow on high intended to fulfil some high purposes for the benefit of the world. Belonging to that Society, I have never wavered in the faith that I shall presently endeavour to put before you. That British Commonwealth of Nations has done many things in the past. It has great exploits to its credit. It has great achievements in the moral sphere to its credit. Doubtless like all human institutions, its history is disfigured by many things which Britishers themselves would be the first to wish they could be forgotten. Doubtless, there are many things which may be pronounced to be serious imperfections and flaws either in the way in which the Commonwealth has been built up or the way in which it is now held together, but we are studying a great political institution.

RECONCILIATION OF EAST AND WEST

We are studying a mass of events connected inextricably with human affairs all over the world, and it were a pity to apply to it our petty measures or our small things. I take it that this great political organisation stands unique amongst the political

institutions of the world for one thing above all others. I wish it were generally recognised. It stands for one thing more than any other and that is the reconciliation of the East and the West, the bringing together in happy harmony, the people of varied races and varied complexions, the blending together under one law, under one sovereign, under the Imperial Parliament, peoples of adverse nationalities, various cultures hitherto felt in many other political organisations to be irreconcilable and never to be brought under one flag. There are, as some of you may have seen, people who sit down and think deeply in these busy times. There are great writers, great thinkers, seers of the future, who would in their moments of hesitation as to the future of our civilisation, the future of our humanity, tell us in solemn tones, that perhaps the world to-day is moving forward at no long period to a great clash between the East and the West, between the white and the coloured populations, and that the clash will be marked by the shedding of more blood, by the destruction of more human property and more human happiness than any clash in the story of our country. Whether that be so or not, it is too much for one connected with the practical affairs of the moment to say, but it does not look impossible. There are many things which seem to point to the hush of smaller and pettier difficulties, and it is not unlikely that we should hear in no long time the rumble of a mighty earthquake whereby this planet will be rudely shaken.

But, Ladies and Gentlemen, if only the British Commonwealth were wisely guided in its time, if only British statesmanship which has always proved equal to the greatest emergencies, if only the British Commonwealth kept its even temper, in spite of ups and downs, in its upward progress, there is no serious risk of this great earthquake submerging this planet. I ask you, Ladies and Gentlemen, where in any Empire, in any political union, there are peoples of so many adverse ways and complexions and cultures as within the British Empire? I ask you to reflect solely to see the march of events from a safe distance of, say, two or three hundred years.

BEGINNING OF A HAPPY SOLUTION

I ask you in all seriousness, whether it is not in this Britannic Commonwealth that we see the beginning of a great and happy solution of these discords, that those who look into the future frighten us with and where in this world wide Empire is the conflict of race with race, of colour with colour, or civilisation with civilisation, more marked, more evidenced, more fraught with possibilities of good and evil, more perplexing to the intelligent student of human affairs, than in this India where we dwell. Here there are great administrators, statesmen, who from day to day are occupied with great affairs—the Viceroy, Governors, the Commander-in-chief—dealing with the administration of a great continent, Members of Councils and great potentates, guiding the destinies of millions, Secretaries of the Government of India, who,

if the secret be told, are only a little more powerful than their Chiefs, Deputy-Secretaries and Under-Secretaries, who, I understand, with the turning of a phrase, may bring into view or turn aside mighty issues,—all who in high spheres or in low making or marring the destinies of millions. You all have passed through an exceptionally trying time.

PERIOD OF TRANSITION

You have my profoundest sympathy for the patience and forbearance with which on both sides you seem to have climbed over the difficulties. It is not my business to say one word that will aggravate the difficulties of the situation, for we are passing through a period of transition. Do let me, in the name of this great Britannic Commonwealth of Nations, ask you to remember that if the Britannic Commonwealth has a high mission and a noble destiny, that mission and that destiny cannot be fulfilled except through you, that on each one of you devolves a part of that high mission and that high destiny. Perhaps some of you immersed as you are in the daily routine of your work, do not realise how great your responsibility is. It is not to the India of to-day, it is not for the Britain of to-day, but it is for the sake of our great civilisation built up through century upon century of heroic effort. I ask you to remember in your daily work that it is not the demands of the hour, it is not the interests that may be immediately vested in you, but if I may venture for one moment to be so impertinent as to say to you, high administra-

tors, that it is not to the reconciliation of vested interests only that your wish and your destiny are to be fulfilled. We never have seen in the country such a wreck of hope and faith in the Government of the day. I say this in all solemnity. We have never seen such a total wreck of faith in the people as to-day. It rests with you to rebuild this hope by constantly remembering that you are but the front wheels of the future, that you are one individually the chosen vehicle of the great spirit of benevolence that has always enabled the British Government in its mission in the world. I venture to think that it is your purpose, as I have no doubt, it is the purpose of all who derive authority from you, to put your faces constantly forward never to turn back in this great work to which you have put your hands, but to see that your duty to India and your duty to the India of the Britannic Commonwealth is nothing less than the great duty you owe to civilisation and to humanity.

Your Excellency, I have been compelled to take up a little of your time, to speak on behalf of this idea of Empire, about which I have been supposed to be a little over-enthusiastic, but as I know that my country cannot prosper except by rising to the fullest political height within the British Commonwealth, I am one of those who identify the British Commonwealth and India in one close and visible union. If I speak of the one, I seem necessarily to be speaking of the other. I wish I had the fire of eloquence to

transmit to you something of the great enthusiasm that I feel for the future of the world and of civilisation of which it seems to me this British Commonwealth is designed by Providence to be the greatest and the noblest of instruments.

Speech at Perth.

"In a speech Miltonic in dignity of phrasing and charged with rare eloquence," the Right Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, P. C., delegate to Australia from the Government of India, urged the claims of his countrymen to racial equality within the Empire, at a State luncheon at Parliament House, at Perth on June 21, 1922. The Acting Premier (Mr. H. P. Colebatch) presided over the gathering, which was representative of every phase of the community's political, commercial and cultural life. Mr. Colebatch briefly proposed the guest's health. After this had been honoured, Mr. Sastri rose to reply amidst sustained applause.

IT is to me a matter of supreme satisfaction, to have been the recipient of such a glad welcome. I was shown around your city yesterday and I can assure you that this enchanting place disclosed fresh beauties at every turn and gave me transports of joy. Perhaps, like a coy beauty, she has hidden charms to which I will remain a stranger. (Laughter.) I wish I could stay somewhat longer in this influential and enterprising city and make the acquaintance of some of its citizens who, I understand, are maintaining its credit amongst the

cities of Australia and adding every day to its prosperity and wealth.

I am come here, deputed by the Government of India on a mission of some considerable importance. Every one of you has heard of the great Imperial Conference of Premiers which sat in London in June last year. That Conference went a long way to cement the great Empire together. More than anything else it taught us the great lesson that this Empire, like other great political structures, is no longer to be based on domination, on conquest or on exploitation, but that its foundations will more and more be based on ideas of brotherhood, of equality and of absolute and even-handed justice all round. (Applause.) Even as amongst individuals we stand up for those high ideals, so amongst the nations composing the great Commonwealth of Britain those ideals will also, if only we do our duty, prevail. I am not going to dwell on the fundamental ideas of Empire before an audience which, I understand, embraces every profession and every noble calling. It would be impertinent of me to try to instruct you in the basic ideas of your great political fraternity. It would be waste of time, even if I had the power to dwell adequately on those broad

IDEAS OF HUMAN FELLOWSHIP

of which the Empire of Britain is coming to be more and more a synonym. (Applause.) I will give the few remarks I will make to-day a somewhat practical and business-like turn. You are, I understand, nearly all

members of the Parliament of Western Australia, or all in positions which are scarcely removed in dignity, and influence from that of members of Parliament. You, therefore, are likely to exercise great influence over the electors and over the ideas which sway the minds of electors at great elections. It is therefore very fitting that I should give my ideas that turn which, while it will make my task easy, will also direct your minds to the one or two things to which I shall venture to ask your attention.

In that Conference to which I alluded, it was laid down as a proposition agreed to by all—and this proposition was without a dissentient although its result had one dissentient—that this Empire has a few Dominions as its constituents and that amongst them India has recently acquired a place of undisputed equality—(applause)—equality which has not been won by force of arms exerted by brother against brother, but which has been won by honourable participation in the risks, perils, and sacrifices of the Great War. (Applause.) That being acknowledged, it has occurred to the great statesmen of the Empire that it is time to canvass all the institutions of our great Britannic Commonwealth and to pull out, without compunction, anything that may distract from its moral as well as its political greatness. (Applause.) Not a very careful scrutiny is required to reveal the disquieting fact that there are a great many disabilities to which the nationals of my country are now subjected—sometimes by law, sometimes by rules and

regulations having the force of law ; but very often by prejudices and, it may be, occasionally, by animosities of a somewhat unjustifiable and temporary character. That these disabilities should rest on the shoulders of a people whose country, however, has been admitted to equality in the Britannic Commonwealth, is recognised to be an incongruity which, if possible, must be removed at an early date. In order to remove this incongruity, it was next agreed—the representative of South Africa alone dissenting—that wherever the people of India resided out of their country with the acquiescence and consent of the peoples amongst whom they so resided, those residents of the Dominions should be admitted without delay, and in the acknowledged interests of the integrity and safety of the British Commonwealth, to the full rights of citizenship of that Dominion. Australia has not much to do to arrive at this consummation ; but there are one or two little things which have to be put right even in the advanced and democratic Constitution of Australia.

INDIANS IN WESTERN AUSTRALIA

Western Australia, in particular, has, in its legal system, one disability to which Indians are subjected. I understand that in Western Australia there are only about 100 Indians all told. They might have been more, but they are at present only about that number. They cannot constitute a serious menace either to the general character of the population, to the homogeneity of the indigenous people or to the political

institutions which from time to time you are fashioning, I understand, in accordance with the highest human ideals. Now these people have some hardships with which I will not at present trouble you, but which I will, in all humility, lay before the Acting Premier in the course of the day. Your attention I wish in particular to draw to the possibility of finding a remedy which will dispense with advocacy by me or by people of my stamp coming over all the way from India and speaking in person to the authorities and to the population generally of Western Australia.

You who are fairest in Parliamentary methods, you who are accustomed to enjoy the benefits of a fairly evolved political constitution, you need not be told of the great value which attaches to the possession of the political vote. (Hear, hear.) To you, perhaps, who have always enjoyed such a vote, its privileges and advantages may not be always present in their liveliness. But to those, who like me are comparatively new to the Parliamentary franchise, to those who know by deprivation its advantages, the value of the political vote is of the supremest order. (Applause.) To have your aspirant for civic honor, to have your young candidate, whose mind is full of beneficent laws which he is going to father, come to you and discuss with you your particular grievances, to have him promise minute attention to your grievances—that is to be placed in a position of advantage which, if it is not continuous from day to day, is, therefore, of the greater value when once in

three years it recurs and shows you how much of the burden of citizenship, as well as its privilege, is in your possession. (Applause.) The hundred and odd people of India who dwell amongst you would be glad of this political vote so that their grievances may receive legitimate expression in Parliament. As I understand it, Parliament is not merely for making laws. Within the ambit of the British Constitution and British institutions, Parliament is there not only to make a Government from time to time, but to keep that Government up to its mark. (Applause.) It is there to inquire continually into grievances. It is there for anybody to find his voice and to speak out the minds and the wishes of any fraction of the population, however small. In fact, the smaller the section represented by a particular member, I know, in chivalrous Parliaments, the greater the attention paid to him when he speaks. (Applause.) My countrymen, I think, will be placed in that position, not of superior advantage, but in that position of the

ELEMENTARY RIGHTS OF CITIZENSHIP

when they will be able to tell themselves: "Now, we are equal with our fellow-citizens of Western Australia. If we have a grievance, we know whom to go to, and if we can at all control that individual, our grievances will be heard by all the representatives of the citizens of Western Australia."

It is that political vote which I would request you to accord with the full will and complete approval of your fellow-citizens who have come from

India to dwell amongst you. This seems too simple a demand, does it not? You would have put it right, probably you would tell me, if they had asked for it in due form. Yes, it is a small matter looked at from that view-point, but it has a larger significance in the councils of Empire. In India as elsewhere, you have a class of people upon whom the recent War and its aftermath have had most extraordinary effect. While, on the one side, you have people who have been more than ever impressed with the beneficence of the Britannic Commonwealth, and its great efficiency as an instrument for furthering human welfare and human civilisation, there are those, one is sorry to think of, on the other side of thought, who look at this thing and that thing and a third thing, and tell themselves, somehow or other, that this is the worst of all possible worlds and that perhaps it is, irredeemably so. You know the type of individual whom I have in mind—the man who specialises in grievances (laughter), who has no better occupation than to dwell continually on the worst aspect of things before him, who is devoid of the power of drawing comfort from his environment and to whom, at every turn, the world has only a sinister and a more sinister significance from day to-day. Now that class of individual whom we have to-day, like other parts of the world, has been, unfortunately, greatly increased by the spread of a big movement called Non-Cooperation, which, departing from the moral and spiritual directions in which it might have had benevolent

effects, has invaded the political sphere. Its votaries, waking and asleep—it may be with the best of intentions in the world—are doing nothing but unmitigated harm. There they are, at work, all day long and through the night, while honest men are asleep. The result is that the great majority of our people are filled with pessimistic ideas. What has the War done to us but increased prices all round, added tremendously to national burdens, and furthermore, disclosed

THE ROTTEN FOUNDATIONS

of this Empire?," they ask. "Where are we Indians within the Empire? What are we? How are our fellow-citizens in the Empire treating us to-day? Do they treat us even as well as Japanese or Chinese, who are outside the British Constitution, and who may be described as aliens and foreigners?" No; in many places, if the truth be told—and I heard it only this morning from my countrymen of Western Australia—it does often happen that when a man is denied something to which he feels himself entitled, he is told not merely that he is an Asiatic, but that he is an Asiatic coming from India, that he is an Indian—as if, instead of entitling him to a more cordial welcome, it does inflict on him *ipso facto* a greater hardship, a more radical disability.

I am grieved to think that there may be even a little foundation for this here and there. Hitherto there has been in South Africa, more than in any other Dominion, much ground for this feeling that

the Indian settled abroad is not welcomed as a fellow-citizen, but stigmatised and oppressed and held up to the ridicule of his fellows for being an Indian. India welcomes people from all the world. Her offices, her places of business, her positions of advantage, her political franchise are open to everybody, even those who do not change their domicile altogether and come and settle there only temporarily. Nothing that is open to an Indian, unless it be the innermost sanctuary of a temple, is not at the same time open to any Westerner. (Applause.) Nay, more, there are many in India who will testify that he really has an advantage over the Indian. In many ways, owing to our political subjection, it is possible for any impartial observer to find to-day the Indian kept out of his rights in order that the Britisher, sometimes an Australian or a Canadian, may have his fullest opportunities for self-expression. If we treat the Dominions in that way, how would the Dominions reciprocate the treatment? Often, often, we are told we are an inferior people. We are treated like an inferior people and we are made to feel at every turn that we are an inferior people. Now our friend the pessimist, whose reading of history is all away, dwells on this aspect until the tears come up in his eyes. He asks, what have we to do with this Empire? It may mean glory; it may mean greatness; it may mean added power; it may mean fresh fields—but for others, not for us! Our opportunities are still restricted. We are bidden to keep rigidly within

the confines of India. Elsewhere we are but-castes, bearers of burdens; never, never sharers of privileges. In such an Empire India is bound to have

A PLACE OF DEGRADATION,

Honour, self-respect opportunities of self-expression, India may not have within the Empire.

I have tried to put the case of my pessimist friend as badly as possible. But my friends, patience is a virtue which all of us preach, but few of us practise. Perhaps, now that I tell you of it, you may be able to remind yourselves of incidents that may be made to wear that sinister complexion within your own knowledge and you would tell me: "Now you have mentioned this matter, don't trouble any more about it. We will put it right." But my point is that not much time should be lost in this, to you small, but to us most essential, matter. Let not my pessimist friend increase in the country until he displaces altogether men of a more wholesome, more promising and more hopeful school of political thought! (Applause.) He is increasing with dangerous facility to-day. I would fain arrest him if I could; and in that work, which I have no doubt you will consider of the highest importance to the Empire, I am really asking your co-operation and assistance. I know that it means to you very little. Then do not grudge it. Give it early and give it willingly, so that I may go back and tell our people: "You are all wrong. The War has indeed changed the psychology of Western peoples. In Australia, to which I went and where I pleaded

your cause, I found willing and sympathetic listeners. They were unaware what was happening ; but now that they are told, nothing will prevent them from rendering justice at the earliest possible opportunity. The simple matter will be put right." Then we will also receive a lesson of hope that, within the British Empire, there is room for a self-respecting India. (Applause.) It is that message that I want, with your authority, to be able to deliver to audiences in India who will come with scepticism in their hearts, with anxiety to learn what I am telling you ; but audiences who, I am sure, will turn all into many bulwarks of this great Britannic Commonwealth.

In India, I can assure you, there is no feeling of repugnance to the idea of Empire. We have a very good, a very lively recollection of what may happen to India were it to travel away under dangerous impulses from the British Empire. If some generation quite new has no recollection of the time before the great Indian Mutiny, say, we have the great warning of Russia to-day. Believe me, in India all about Russia is wellknown. India may not be able to relieve out of her abundance the necessities of Russia to any great extent ; but some of her political students have found parallelisms deep and significant between the condition of Russia and that of India. They have followed with a minuteness perhaps not known to many of you here, the events of Russia and of Ireland. They draw from them some wise and some unwise lessons ; but they know one thing—that

a revolution means dire disaster—(applause)—from which, perhaps Russia, with the aid of America, may recover one day, but from which it is very, very doubtful whether India could recover if

BY ANY FATAL MISCHANCE

she once was plunged therein. We know it only too well, and my pessimistic friend more than others. But still you can sympathise—you will not approve—and you can understand that morbid condition of mind which, in the student of the history of political institutions, is often produced by the contemplation solely of grievances—real, genuine, heart-breaking grievances. In India, some of them inflict on us anguish and humiliation which I cannot adequately describe..... But, in spite of ups and downs, anyone who surveys the history of the world must, if his judgment is sound, only register progress in capital letters. (Applause.) Help my pessimistic friend to read history as you do..... I know you will have to change some of your laws in order to effect for the Indians the political vote; but your laws may not take long to change.

Our claim within the Empire is not that you shall treat us like other Asiatics, but that you should recognise that we belong to this great, beneficent institution of the British Empire like you, recognise that kinship of spirit, and put us really in a position of advantage compared with other Asiatics.... I apologise for having referred to what some of you may consider platitudinous affairs. But even platitudes

sometimes we forgive...Platitudes, if neglected, often develop into grievances, disturbing our peace of mind. This somewhat undesirable task I have performed with your kind leave.

The conclusion of Mr. Sastri's address was marked by a great outburst of applause. All present joined in singing "For He's a Jolly Good Fellow," following this by cheering again and again.

Address to New Zealand Parliament.

[Mr. Sastri was the guest of the Government at a Parliamentary luncheon at Wellington on July 12, 1922. The Prime Minister, Mr. Massey, presided and there was a full attendance of Ministers of the Crown, and of Members of the Legislative Council and the House of Representatives. Mr. Massey in proposing the toast of the guest said "that this was not the first time he and Mr. Sastri had met. For four or five hours a day for two or three months in the early part of last year they had met around that old Council table in Downing Street, of which so much had been heard. He had very pleasant recollections of their guest's representation of the Government and people of India. (Applause.) Looking back at the representatives of India at various conferences that had been held, he could say that there were no better men in the Empire than those of whom he was thinking—the Maharaja of Bikaner, the Maharaja of Patiala, the Maharao of Cutch, Lord Sinha and, by no means the least, Mr. Sastri." Replying, Mr. Sastri said :—

WE have just started, and we are looking for guidance to our elder sisters. You in New Zealand have traditions which have not yet become hoary, but we are quite young. We are babes, as it were, in the art of Parliamentary Government.

Nevertheless, starting rather late and with brilliant examples ahead of us, I believe that in a few years we shall prove ourselves quite worthy of the Mother of Parliaments, from which we all spring (Applause). I have belonged to what is called the Council of State in India. We are not yet a Dominion in India, and our Houses are not yet described by the great name of Parliament, nor are we entitled to put the great letters 'M. P.' after our names. But we are all 'honourable' men. (Hear, hear.) We are striving all we can to realise in our two Houses the great traditions and honourable practices and chivalrous relations that obtain among the individuals and the various parties in the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain. We have a great Speaker to guide us, and we believe that in a very short time we shall have learnt a good deal, and that the New Zealand Parliament, among others, will have no reason to be ashamed of the way in which its younger sister is coming close behind. India's Parliament may catch up the older Parliaments and may even pass them.

DOMINION STATUS DEMANDED

In our demand to become a Dominion I know that I have the sympathy of Mr. Massey, among others. I know also that in the Dominions generally there is a feeling, now stronger than in the days before the War, that the Empire's highest achievements are possible only when all its parts have come together and are seated at the common table in full

recognition that they are the equals, one of another, that there is no difference of rank and status amongst themselves, and that they are all alike instruments, both useful and efficient, in the working out of the destinies of an Empire greater and more glorious than history has ever recorded. (Applause.)

But great as the achievements of our Commonwealth have been, there are still greater things for the Empire to do before we can assure ourselves that human civilisation and human welfare have been placed beyond peril. There is to-day nothing so prominent as the likely clash of East and West. There is nothing that our great thinkers of to-day are so anxious about as the probable conflict between the civilisations that have come together, not perhaps through any design of their own but under the will of Providence, for aims greater than we can see to-day. We are all alike bound in duty to see that that clash and that conflict are averted altogether, and if it is possible for any human agency to stop the catastrophe, I know of none so well qualified to perform this high mission than the British Empire. (Applause.) The British Empire more than any other political institution is the meeting ground of races and civilisations and countries and continents. It has been tested many times before, and it will still be tested, and we want to be sure that British statesmanship—and in that expression I include Indian statesmanship—will be quite equal to any trials by which our Empire may be tested in the future.

INDIA'S THOUGHT.

In India there is prevalent a political movement of much significance. I am not sure that in New Zealand its character and magnitude are quite appreciated. I have no time to-day to state in full detail the exact proportions and lineaments of that movement, but its leading feature is quite easy to indicate in a few sentences. I wish to be quite candid. I am speaking as a member of one Parliament to members of another Parliament. There is to-day a large number of people in India—I will not say yet the number is alarmingly large—who were perfectly contented during the War, who were anxious for nothing so much as for India to make her fullest contribution of sacrifice and hardship. Such people to-day are anxiously examining this question: "We struggled for this Empire, we still wish to believe in this Empire and to be proud of it. But would it be right for us so commit our generations and coming generations in India to participation in the British Empire? Is our position there exactly conformable with our aspirations or with our great traditions."

In other words, are the authorities of the British Empire, sitting in Whitehall and influenced by the opinion of the Dominions to a large extent, are they fully aware of what India will demand if she is to take her place among the nations that compose the Empire? That demand in the eyes of India is nothing unreasonable. In the eyes of India it is a demand which practically has been granted in advance

by the policy of statesmen, enunciated in State papers, by declarations, by pledges, by promises of a most sacred and binding character. But the fulfilment of these declarations of policy and promises and pledges has been rather slow in coming. The history of modern India is all written in letters that anybody can read. The students at our universities, young men who are to be in the future the citizens not only of India but of our great Empire, they are asking themselves this most anxious and momentous question: 'Should we be right, should we be doing our duty to our children in asking them to identify themselves and their fortunes with the British Empire?'

REAL LIBERTY

We are anxious—a great many of us are anxious—to enable them to answer that question in the affirmative. (Hear, hear.) For myself I am a believer in this Empire. I am an admirer of the heroism, pluck, and enterprise that have gone to build it. I am a believer that to those qualities there can be added a keen and burning desire to distribute fairly and equitably the benefits and advantages of the Empire amongst the various people that compose it. (Applause.)

I know that amongst a great part of the white population of the Empire there is a real love of liberty, not merely that false love of liberty which loves it when it pertains to oneself, but that nobler and richer form of love of liberty which desires to extend it to all deserving and loyal neighbours, and will not rest

until these deserving and loyal neighbours are in the enjoyment of as much liberty of themselves. (Hear, hear.) With that sympathy and spirit and that love of the higher Imperialism we still hope to keep India loyal and contented within the Empire, looking for her political salvation within the bounds of this magnificent political institution.

A REAL SENSE OF GRIEVANCE

Perhaps India, going outside the Empire, will be daring Providence and bringing upon herself risks and perils and calamities which we cannot describe, and which it is difficult even to imagine. We know that. But, fellow-citizens of the Empire, you know that there is a state of mind that seizing hold of a proud people, inheritors of an ancient civilisation, impels them to seek all perils and all calamities in the pursuit of liberty. (Applause.) If there are, then, any inequalities which press hard on our fellow citizens, we are all alike bound to remove those inequalities. If there is a sense of grievance well founded in fact, we are all bound to examine it carefully and to see that it is removed at the earliest possible moment, for there is nothing that will dissolve an Empire as soon as a grievance in a numerous civilised community. There is a real sense of grievance in India I am bound to say, speaking to responsible people as a responsible person, that there is a good deal we have got to examine in the position of Indians at home and in other parts of the Empire.

INDIANS ABROAD

At home we are still far short of being a Dominion. But everything points to sure and certain progress in that direction. I am not in sympathy with those in India who believe that the present constitution is but a sham, a delusion, and a snare. I am one of those who believe that the present constitution is carefully compiled, is likely to lead to better and better conditions, and will before long lead to full Dominion status. I am not anxious at all on that score. But I am certainly anxious about the position which the white populations in different parts of Empire have hitherto accorded to those Indians who are lawfully domiciled amongst them. That expression, lawfully domiciled, requires some explanation. We have agreed during recent years to an understanding by which the white populations keep out Indians to the extent they desire. You are allowed, with our consent in India, to exclude our people, thus freeing you from the fear of being swamped with people whom you cannot assimilate, and who, you fear, would seriously disturb and even dislocate your economic position. We are resolved for our part to keep our people within our own borders. That point being secure, we now ask you to treat fairly and justly those Indians who happened to be domiciled before the advent of that fact of exclusion. (Hear hear.) Not that it matters very much in New Zealand. Our people here are not subject to any disabilities at all. You are treating

them already with justice and fairness, and I have no complaint to make.

We are looking at the Empire as a whole, and in other parts the conditions are not so bright and so free from anxiety. Our men are subject still to anxieties and hardships, and in some cases to indignities and privations, the mere narration of which will seem to you not as a description of anything happening in the British Empire, but as something happening in a barbarous empire. But they are there, hard facts and undesirable conditions that we are bound to help in getting rid of. I am not here to fill your mind with any alarm or suspicion, but only to ask you to help me at an early date to furnish these pessimistic friends of mine in India with proofs that where lawfully domiciled within the Empire Indians will be treated as equal citizens of the Empire. (Applause.)

That is a necessary condition to India loyally remaining within the Empire. We cannot be proud of the Empire in the same sense in which you are proud of the Empire. We are glad to belong to it. Many advantages come to us from being in the Empire. But if we cannot be proud of our position in it, we will terminate it and seek our destiny elsewhere, rather than continue where as a matter of deliberate policy disabilities are placed upon us.

Of that there is no more any doubt. India's self-consciousness has become so strong that it is impossible for us hereafter by any subterfuge or camouflage any longer to keep from India

this feeling that they must strive to get rid of inequalities.

RANKLING SENSE OF INJUSTICE

A rankling sense of injustice is a greater danger to the Empire than anything else we can think of. No foreign power, no cataclysm of an international character can shake the Empire so much as the continued existence of an injustice admitted to be irremovable. I believe that these inequalities need not exist, that the Empire will be greater for their removal and that with their removal the Empire will really be what we often say it is, an Empire of moral value to its peoples, an Empire where all deserving people are equal before the law.

This Empire stands, if it stands for anything, for justice, for absolute equality, for brotherhood amongst the peoples. We are an association of free peoples come together for the enjoyment of free institutions. We cannot deny equality to Indians and still maintain the Empire is what it could be, or what it should be. You will all admit that India has a case which it is not wise any longer to delay examining on its merits. Statesmen in India are engaged in the task of examining these matters. I should be false to the truth, I should be false to my own conviction if I did not say that in Great Britain, notwithstanding the healing and chastening influences of War, the old pre-war feeling that the Empire stands for the Dominion of one people over another people has still some power and strength. We are all human,

and we know that human feelings are hard to eradicate. From Great Britain many of these unfair ideas of Empire—I use no harsher expression—many of these lower ideas of Empire, have been banished, but still they are to some extent powerful. They are hindering the progress of this magnificent and superb idea of equality.

LOOKING TO THE DOMINIONS

I am hoping that in the Dominions these ideas are not discernible in any strength. It seems to me that there is a duty resting on these young communities that are proud of their Empire to cleanse the Empire of these Old World notions that are only keeping the Empire back. Then the Empire will go forward into these realms of purity and pure justice where, once established the British Empire would be co-terminous with the empire of reason, of humanity, of perfect equality and brotherhood among the peoples. These ideas once firmly established in the Empire that we call a lesser League of Nations, they will soon travel outside and perhaps impress the whole of humanity. We shall then see the advent of the millenium, which at present is only in the minds of poets and philosophers, but which even statesmen may then seek to bring within the practical politics. My most humble and earnest request to you is that you will make up your minds to strengthen the new and make it a real temple of freedom. (Applause).

The Prime Minister called for cheers for Mr. Sastri—which was well responded.

Address to Students at Wellington

Addressing a crowded assemblage of students at Victoria College, Wellington on the 13th July 1922, Mr. Sastri spoke of the New Constitution in India. Mr. P. Levy, Chairman of the College Council presided. In the course of what was described by the Australian Press as a "fluent, effortless speech" Mr. Sastri said :—

MY subject, will be the new constitution of India. It has some peculiar features. The average Englishman is inclined to think that there is only one constitution, and that all others are liable to end in confusion. The Indian Constitution is transitory, and when it has reached its maturity it may not be an exact copy of the British Constitution ; already it varies from it in many respects. In 1917 the British Government announced its policy of gradually endowing India with responsible Government by progressive measures, and it is the British aim to reach that goal step by step. This caution was no doubt dictated partly by the fear that perhaps the sudden erection of full responsible Government might be too much for the political talent available, and many are still doubtful if it is wise to transplant a Western system of government into a land where for long centuries nothing of the kind has been known.

Instead of experimenting with one province under complete responsible government, Britain decided to take every province into account, and while not handing over complete control, to give the Indians the easier portion of the work, retaining the more difficult for her own representatives. In all nine provinces, therefore, all functions were divided into two portions; one, known as transferred subjects, comprising sanitation, forests, public works, education, etc., and the other, known as reserved subjects, such as police and justice, law, taxation, and revenue, etc. The provincial governments are comprised of Ministers responsible to Parliament, and Councillors. The number of Ministers varies, according to the size of the province, some have two, some four. The Ministers are subject to restrictions which do not apply to the counsellors, the latter not being necessarily bound to accept criticism or carry out Parliamentary resolutions. Parliament may criticise, but does not wholly control. The Governor is a sort of arbiter between the two branches of the Government; when they fail to agree he decides between them, a difficult part.

There are three Ministers in each large province, and four of the executive counsellors. All the former and two of the latter are Indians, and there are only three Europeans (the Governor and two of the executive counsellors) So there is a numerical Indian majority in provincial councils, which are Indian in character. In the Central Government

there are three Indians and four British a predominance of British influence. The system of provincial government has worked well. No Governor has found it necessary to use his powers save in the case of one province. Parliament has been allowed therefore to exercise practically all its powers over both 'transferred' and 'reserved' subjects.

THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT.

How has the Central Government, with powers to veto, worked? The Governor-General, a wise man, let it be known that he was not anxious to use his supreme power, and that he would forbear to use it at all if possible. That sense of responsibility cast on the provincial governments has steadied them to such an extent that the powers of veto might not have existed at all, so far as they were concerned. Thus the Constitution has happily frustrated the chief objections raised to it.

This form of government is known as the diarchy (or dyarchy), or dual authority. Such a form of control has elsewhere proved notoriously unstable, and India's politicians agreed with diffidence to accept it, but they were sure of its charitable application by the British Government. The original proposal was that while the people were to have a little power in the provincial Governments, they were to be shut out of all authority in the Central Government. To provide an adequate machinery to allow of the exercise of the popular will there were formed an Indian Council of State and a Legislative Assembly, and

these two Houses had to agree in all legislation to be effective. The Assembly alone could deal with taxation; the other House could, and had, to promulgate legislation frequently. The Vice-Regal Governor-General, controlling 300,000,000 of the people, was not a member of the Legislature.

MANY INNOVATIONS

The New Constitution brought in innovations. Formerly, the Governor was responsible for the control of the remotest parts of India, the Governors of which were merely his agents. This led to undue delays in correspondence and dealing with matters of importance. The New Constitution removed this at one stroke, as all provincial Governments have now full powers under their immediate jurisdiction, and separate from the Central Government. Such matters as posts and telegraphs, defence, railroads, and Customs, can be dealt with by provincial Governments, while taxation, etc., is handled by the Central Government.

Many of the points that arise might seem ludicrous to older Constitutions. If the Governor wishes a law to be passed he must first submit a draft of the proposal to Parliament. When the Parliament's will is made known, he either accepts or dismisses it. What he gazettes is law. What Parliament passes he is not bound to accept. That is the prevailing principle of our Provincial Government. But in the Central Administration all subjects are 'reserved' and none 'transferred' to the people. The

merit of the system lies in the method by which the continuous steps to Self-Government may be taken. A section of the Act lays down that at the end of two years Parliament in Britain shall send a commission throughout India, impartially reviewing what has been done, the recommending or refusing changes in the Constitution, thus avoiding unseemly wrangles and assuring the compulsory advancement of the Constitution. The Indian Constitution has been struggled for long and arduously, and we mean to deserve, and get more.

All the higher officials in the Government service are appointed by the British Government, and none at all by the Government of India. That seems, and indeed is an anomaly. The better basis would have been for the people of India to have had a voice in the appointment of these agents of daily administration. The military question is one of great importance. Indian critics say that the Army is larger than is needed for the defence of India, but British opinion differs. The control is solely in the hands of the Viceroy and his counsellors: the Legislature must not even discuss this matter. This is a great exclusion and a great detraction from the dignity of Parliament but this is a legacy from old times that cannot be helped. Another point is that Indian Army officers in India bear only the Viceroy's commission and not the King's, although some thirty, only a few amongst thousands, were recently given the King's commission. This policy of distrust of the

Indian people is strong, and it will be years before the control of the Army will be Indian. Military secrets are jealously guarded; such as the management of the newer engines of war.

REFINEMENT OF DISTRUST

It is said, that such a Constitution may easily break down. But we are the inheritors of a great and noble culture, during the evolution of which we have produced the greatest poets and thinkers of the world. We have the culture of the Brahmin, the chivalry of the Rajput (than whom no knight of olden days was more chivalrous), the warrior characteristics of the Maharatta, the bravery of the Sikhs, the commercial enterprise of the Parsee. There is talent of no-kind which we lack. It is a cruelty and refinement of distrust unparalleled in the treatment of any subject race that we are not allowed to control our military machine in its more modern aspects. A policy of complete confidence will alone allow us to carry out our Constitution fully. After 150 years of British supremacy in India, the first step in this policy has been taken. We are committed to it, and will not go back. Is it fair to cast doubts upon it? India is bound in time to deserve its own system of responsible Government, and to become actually, as we now are in theory, equal partners in the British Commonwealth." (Applause.)

Reply to Civic Welcome at Suva

On his way from New Zealand to Canada Mr. Sastri took the opportunity of seeing our countrymen in Suva, the capital of Fiji Islands on July 29, 1922. Mr. Sastri on arrival was presented with an address by the Indian community of Fiji. A Civic Reception was extended to him at the Town Hall by the Mayor, the Hon. Mr. H. M. Scott, K. C. The Governor, the Chief Justice and the principal officers of Government were present. The Mayor welcoming Mr. Sastri on behalf of the Municipality reminded the audience of Mr. Sastri's services to the Empire and said that he has displayed "a dignity of bearing, a mastery of the English language, a rare eloquence, and an education of thought which shows what India at its best is producing." Replying to the Mayor, Mr. Sastri delivered the following address:—

YOUR Excellency, your Honour, Mr. Mayor and citizens of Suva: It gives me very great pleasure indeed to meet such a distinguished gathering at short notice, just on my way to Canada. I had received a welcome of a most flattering description, both in Australia and New Zealand, and I am very happy to find that, in Fiji I am not less welcome. (Applause.) I rather think it was a pity that business kept me away when I might have been here and

spent a long time trying to understand the problems of Fiji, but it is no use repenting it. I am very happy to think that some representative gentlemen came over from India and paid attention to the problems of Fiji, which their importance, and perhaps also their complexity, required. Their report has not been published, at all events I do not know what their recommendations and findings are. It is not possible for me, therefore, to say anything of personal knowledge concerning the questions that vex you, from day to day; but I may be allowed, while I am passing through, just to tell you why the Government of India laid a duty on me, which I have been proud to discharge to the best of my ability, why they have sent me to see the Dominions personally, and speak to the authorities in each Dominion, to Parliaments, and to the electors of the Dominions on matters of consequence. There is no time for me to wrap what I have to say in euphemisms or pleasing phrases. I shall only speak just as, I think, I have ventured to do elsewhere. The Mayor was, a minute ago, pleased to describe me as a good citizen of the Empire. I believe I can claim that honour. (Applause.) I have great faith in the Empire and its mission. I have, at the same time, an idea of its purpose which perhaps some who call themselves imperialists do not entertain. I think of the Empire, not so much as to its pact, but as to its future, for there are many things of deep import—some of our most radical ideas, some that have concerns

with the very roots of life—which have been entirely changed since the War as, in a flash, the danger to the British Empire has been made clear to people and, as in a flash, its strength in trial has been displayed; and I am proud to think that, when the need did come in all its insistence, the people of India forgot their little grievances and stood by the side of the white populations for maintaining, not merely the material glory of the Empire, but for sustaining its moral and spiritual basis. (Applause.) Now that the trial has passed away, and the Empire has come out stronger within itself than ever before, it rests with us, citizens of the future, no less than of the past, to see that all that might make for weakness in the Empire is eliminated; that everything that may tend to keep people from people within the Empire, should, if possible, be set aside mercilessly; and that the Empire should stand a guarantee for ever of peace and good-will amongst the peoples of the world and of civilisation. (Applause.) When we keep in view this very great end, the paramount need of maintaining the Empire on its moral basis, all petty considerations, such as we have hitherto hugged to our bosom, must give way, sectarian interests, however big, however longstanding, ought to have no consideration. Community should welcome community for the British Empire now stands by public declarations which cannot be neglected, the British Empire now stands for the union of races, for the coming together of different civilisa-

tions, for complete brotherhood, so far as it is possible to establish it, between the East and the West, between the coloured and the colourless populations of the Empire. (Applause.) That is why, during the War and after the War, statesmen of the Empire have met in anxious consultation. India, now recognised to be an equal partner in this mighty political organisation, has had to say something, which, in the opinion of its statesmen and in the considered judgment of its Government, militated against this feeling of consolidation of the Empire, of which I have ventured to speak to you. These considerations have been preying on the minds of the statesmen of the Empire, not merely in England but all over the world. Colonial statesmen of rank have given themselves much thought as to how it is possible to bridge the gulf that has so long stood between community and community within the Empire. I do not say that the problem is easy to solve; I do not say that the problem can be quickly solved; I do not say that the consummation that we true Imperialists have at heart can be arrived at promptly or within a short time; but I do maintain that it is the duty of everyone who stands, not merely for the law, but for the higher ideal of Empire, to see that no moment is lost in declaring and understanding these problems, in setting our faces forward, and in truly and really starting an era of complete equality and brotherhood of the populations that compose the Empire, the populations which have been described by the Prime

Minister himself as a free people coming together in a free brotherhood.

GOVT. OF INDIA'S DIFFICULTIES

As I told you before, we are strong enough, I think, and most of us are brave enough, to talk candidly to one another. There is no use in consulting one another's susceptibilities in matters where the truest interests of the Empire are concerned, and I will therefore speak out what is in my mind: because I know that it is in the minds also of the guardians of the Empire; it is in the minds also of the Government of India, whose commission I am proud to bear for the time being. Now, the Government of India are faced with political difficulties in India, of which I could wish that their compatriots in the Dominions had a clearer idea and a more vivid perception than they seem to have shown so far. The difficulties in that part of the British Empire are of a tremendous order. Indians have settled in various parts of the Empire, in self-governing Dominions, in Crown Colonies, in Protectorates of one kind or another, in every one of those places outside India. It is true to say, alas, that the Indian is not yet treated as an equal subject of his Majesty. There are many disabilities, many subtractions from his citizenship, and, in some places, which I will not name, there are even humiliations and indignities heaped upon him. As I said before, in India these things are now, more than ever, watched with meticulous care. Indians have one characteristic in common with

other peoples, in that they have a certain amount of pride. To be told, sometimes in so many words, sometimes indirectly, that they are but an inferior component of the Britannic Commonwealth, does not improve their temper. They are not soothed by any means when you tell them, as you did, 'You are a people whom we do not propose yet to admit to complete equality, you are a people of a subordinate status, of a different civilisation; we cannot assimilate it.' I am not here to say that 'quality' and 'brotherhood' are ideas so simple and easy that you have only got to announce them, that you have only got to put them down on paper in documents, and they will be realised. People's minds have to be charged, and inner conversion to real Christianity has to take place amongst those who have hitherto held the power, held the privilege, held the first place, to the exclusion of others. It is not the work of a day, it takes some time, it will take some education; but I am one of those who believe that the current now sets in the right direction; I am one of those who believe that, even in the most unpromising places of the British Empire, since the War there is a recognition that there is a higher law of the Empire, a deeper significance in the Empire's mission, a higher and nobler purpose which the Empire has still to fulfil, and of which every Britisher has to be the vehicle in spirit, as well as in words. I am, therefore, full of hopes that, when the wishes of the Government of India in this matter be identi-

cal with the wishes of the people of India, and when the wishes of the Government and of the people of India are known, I am happy to think they will not be set aside any more with light hearts. In Australia and New Zealand, I found a sympathetic reception of this message. My message was this ; 'That there must be, as early as possible, fulfilment of the resolution that the 1921 Conference of the Empire Statesmen passed.'

RESOLUTION OF IMPERIAL CONFERENCE

I had the honour of taking a share in the proceedings of that Conference. The case for the status of Indians was stated in full. It received thorough discussion, and, after realising its fullest consequences, the resolution which they passed was, more or less, to this effect : 'Now that India has been admitted to equal partnership in the Empire, the existence of disabilities of her nationals, duly settled in any part of the Empire, is an incongruity which ought to be swept away as quickly as possible.' In order that that consummation may be reached, it is desirable that the rights of Indians, wherever domiciled, should be recognised to full citizenship. To this resolution many members of the Imperial Cabinet, including the Prime Minister and the Colonial Minister, were parties, The Prime Minister of Australia, the Prime Minister of New Zealand, and the Prime Minister of Canada were parties to it. Mr. Winston Churchill represented the Crown Colonies and Protectorates. South Africa alone was not a party to this, because South Africa has its

own difficulties, and the matter there is not so easy as it is elsewhere. That peculiar position was recognised, and General Smuts, who represented South Africa, was allowed to exclude himself and the Union of South Africa from the scope of that resolution ; but everybody else agreed to it, and it so happens, therefore, that all Crown Colonies and Protectorates, and self-governing Dominions, with that exception, were practically counselled to see that this policy is carried out. Now that policy is the removal of disabilities existing on Indians lawfully settled and the admission of them to the full rights of British citizenship, the same as other classes of his Majesty's loyal subjects. It is that that I went to plead in Australia and New Zealand ; it is that that I will plead, in the course of a few weeks, in Canada ; and I will tell you just this thing, that, when I placed the case before the people of Australia and New Zealand, while the Governments were, naturally, not able to commit themselves and give me definite promises, I found everywhere amongst the various classes complete approbation of my sentiments, the profoundest sympathy with the views of the Government of India, and the most encouraging recognition of the claims that I put forward on behalf of Indians.

A DANGER TO THE EMPIRE

I know only too well that there are parts of the Empire which have hitherto been run on a basis of inequality. There the problem, therefore, is a little more difficult than elsewhere, and I am perfectly

willing to recognise, for my part, that this work of breaking barriers between communities is not an easy work; but all I ask is that everywhere to-day there must be a heartfelt admission of the end in view; everywhere to-day there must be a readiness to adjust arrangements so that the march towards that goal should begin immediately and proceed ceaselessly until the end is attained. When I say 'must' all I mean is that that is the requirement of the Empire, for what are the words used by the conference to which I have just referred? The words are: 'in the interests of the solidarity of the British Empire.' No words from me are required to put a gloss on that expression—'in the interests of the solidarity of the Britannic Commonwealth.' It means that it is felt by people all over that the continuance of this status of inequality, of this basis of privilege on one side, and obligations only on the other, if continued, would mean danger to the Empire, would mean the beginning of an unhappy state of things which no people whatever ought to see for one moment. As I told you before, I know human nature is the same in India as in England and everywhere; I know it is very, very difficult to part from rights and privileges, and immunities and special advances: but if it is necessary to do so in the interests of the Empire, I think that one is entitled to ask that even that sacrifice must be cheerfully borne for the sake of one great political organization, which alone can guarantee peace for humanity in the future, which alone can guarantee the

genuine acquisition on those ideals, for the great teachers of humanity have always stood for those ideals of equality and brotherhood, which within the British Empire, are often secularly described as one law, the same opportunities for all, the fullest scope within the Empire and under the Union Jack for every man and every woman to develop himself or herself, according to the endowments with which God has pleased to start them in life. If all are equal in religion, all are equal in a certain sense within the Empire. Not to recognise it is to run counter to the requirements and teaching of all religions, and likewise also to forget the higher purpose of the British Empire. Too many of us are apt to give a theoretic recognition to their ideals, to say 'Yes,' but let it be twenty years hence, when I am dead and buried; let everything start with another generation, let the present generation go on as it does'; but that is where the difficulty of India, the special message that I am commissioned to bear, comes in. I am to exhort you, on the one side and on the other, to exercise patience and mutual sympathy, and to put the best that is in you into this work of complete understanding amongst the component parts of the British Empire, and to do it as soon as possible.

NO EXCUSE FOR DELAY.

As I said, the full achievement may take time, but there is no excuse for causing any delay, for merely putting off things for another generation, for I

know this, as a student of Indian history, that ever since her Majesty Queen Victoria took over the administration of India, Indians have been accustomed to hear and read the finest sentiments. School boys of three generations ago in India were told that the Union Jack, wherever it flew, meant continued progress towards British ideals of equality and justice and brotherhood. Subsequently, time after time, royalty, and authority derived from royalty, has proclaimed and repeated these pledges to us: they have been very slow in fulfilment. Sometimes it seemed to us painfully slow sometimes, alas, it seemed to us that there were statesmen who even went so far as to say that these ideals are only for ornamental decoration in public despatches, and that they are not meant for actual fulfilment in private life in daily administration, in the conduct of the various Governments. That, however, is no longer the case; it is now admitted everywhere that these are the true ideals. And of all the things that have continually extorted my admiration amongst my own people this has extorted the most admiration, the patience that Indians have shown during these many decades while these ideals were only slowly fulfilling, the hope that they have not allowed to die within their breasts that one day these ideals are going to be actualities, and not merely copy book maxims. That will stand always in the judgment of any historian, however prejudiced; that will stand always to the credit of the Indian people.

A TRIBUTE TO MR. GANDHI.

Even now, during the progress of the great Non-Co-operation movement, which threatened far more perhaps than ever you suspected, even now when the Indian National Congress the other day threw over the words 'within the British Empire,' who was it that kept India still on the right side? You would be astonished to hear that it was Mr. Gandhi. While a great part of his following insisted on his adoption of violent methods, they likewise insisted that the creed of the greatest political organization in India should be so altered as to permit their taking India out of the British Empire into the wilderness of politics, into the region of chaos and anarchy, for they said 'we prefer that we shall be allowed the freedom to ruin ourselves, we prefer that to an existence on a subordinate footing with the British Empire.' It was Mr. Gandhi, from whose politics I differ very much who used his personal influence and advised his followers not to be so rash, for he said, 'whatever you say of the British Empire, I know one thing' speaking as though I were Mr. Gandhi, for a minute: 'I am against all Government in the universe, I do not like one person to control another and to have governmental power over him; nevertheless, I live under the British Government, because I believe that, of all human Governments, the British Empire governs the least.' That means that, within the British Empire, the individual citizen enjoys more real freedom of movement and action than the

individual citizen enjoys anywhere, even under Governments which are said to be democratic.

It is a great asset that British statesmen have today, it is a great asset, this belief in the ideals of Empire, which dominates the minds of the people who have great grievances in India, and who feel that in the seeking of the redress of these grievances they may take a drastic step. Even they, however, are willing to learn that the best interests of India lie within the British Empire: that the glory of the British constitution is that by peaceful and constitutional means exclusively it is possible for a people to rise from the status of a mere dependency to the level of a self-governing dominion. The best minds of India have now recognised that they have been allowed to rise from a position of mere dependence, and that, through the Government of India Act of 1919, they are well and firmly established on the high road to full responsible government. Do not, by anything that you do in any part of the Empire, shake that confidence, or undermine it. I pray you, ladies and gentlemen on whom rests the future policy of the Empire, remember that each one of you has to be the vehicle of the higher spirit, of the nobler mission of the Empire, and not any longer to wish the continuance of the lower ideals of the more material order.

A WORD TO INDIANS.

Now, a word to my Indian fellow subjects exclusively. May I tell them that there is an inexor-

able condition which must be fulfilled before this mighty work of changing the basis of Empire from one of domination to one of equality can be fulfilled. It is a great and mighty work, to which statesmen have to address themselves, and they cannot do it, they cannot march steadily from step to step, unless they are assured of our complete loyalty to the Empire and its ideals. If, as often as power is transferred in India to the representatives of the people, they use it so as to convince statesmen that the extra power, the additional status, the improved position and privilege will all be used only for the good of India within the Empire, then their work will be continuous, their work will be a pleasure, and in no long time our efforts will be crowned with success. I will, therefore, ask them to exercise the patience, the good faith in British ideals, which they have shown so far, for all things under Providence come to those that wait, that believe, and that allow Providence to work its ends in its own ways, and in its own goodness of time. Do not listen to those who come and advise you, now and then, to try your own hand at reconstruction, to pull down, destroy, create chaos in the hope that out of chaos somebody else will come and build you up a cosmos: it never will be done. Within the British constitution it is possible to change all things slowly and gradually, without adopting revolutionary methods. That is the glory of the British constitution above all other constitutions. While great improvements are possible in other political organisations

only through revolution, through violence, through disruption, by the British constitution it is possible to be effected by change of opinion, by continual political education, by mutual consultation, by compromise, or by the exercise of mutual forbearance and mutual good-will.

Speech at the Reform Club, Montreal

[Addressing the Members of the Reform Club, Montreal, in Sept. 1922, Mr. Sastri spoke of the culture and traditions of India and referred to her position in the British Commonwealth. The President of the Club who presided over the Luncheon introduced Mr. Sastri in a felicitous speech. Mr. Sastri "was nothing if not frank and blunt in telling of the terms under which India is willing to remain within the Empire" The following report of the speech appeared in the Montreal Gazette.]

"NEITHER Britain nor any Dominion can afford to play bully with India any longer, and we in India, let me tell you once for all, are determined to be bullied no longer. If we are going to be equal partners with the rest of the Empire in the maintenance of peace, we will contribute what we can to its might, strength and majesty, for we have a contribution to make to the world, and we are prepared and willing to make it under the Union Jack, if the Union Jack is going to bring us the maintenance of self-respect, and our own sense of honor. Otherwise, much as we should regret it we must seek our political salvation outside of this great political organization.

NO RACE DISTINCTION

“ We want to dwell within the Empire. I have told you what will keep us within it, you—and I mean you, the people of Canada exactly—can keep us within the British Empire only if you enable us to take pride in the British Empire just as you do. The fact is that to-day we admire and study its history with reverence, and value its connection because it is profitable, because it promises more than anything else to pull us slowly towards constitutional government, but all this is not sufficient. You must bind our sentiment also, and the strongest sentiment with us is pride. Make us be proud of the Empire; and we can be proud of the Empire only when that Empire stands absolutely for justice and equality and brotherhood amongst the peoples. If it stands, as it did, for domination, for exploitation, for the glorification of any one race or any one color, of any one people of any one place, we cannot be proud of it, and you ought not to be proud of it, but that is your affair. So far we have reaped of its benefits, shouldered its responsibilities and carried its burden, but we are still not proud of it because its strength has been built upon our weakness, its riches have been accumulated by keeping us poor, its power in the world has been possible because we were a subject nation, and because our strength could be used subordinated to their strength. Your merit has been our demerit, but we are willing to forget the past. Indians, after all, are a wise people, and know where their bread is but-

tered. We are perfectly willing to wipe off the past. We will be true to this British connection, and will do the best we can to help it, provided that the Empire is what it purports to be, an organization of free peoples, coming together freely for the maintenance and extension of free institutions. Let us be free in the sense in which you are free, and then the whole can combine to make the rest of the world free, and then indeed this planet shall be a planet where nations shall have learned to respect, tolerate, love and befriend one another."

NOT REBELLION OF PEOPLE

As to the ability of the people of India to sever the link with the Empire, Mr. Sastri had no doubt that it could be done when the people so wished. The people of India had never sought to free themselves, to put their full strength into such a movement. The Indian mutiny was not a rebellion of the people, but of sepoys which had been much magnified. Trouble had come in the time of Lord Curzon over the Bengal partition, and the fiery cross had gone from village to village, and the people called on to rise. That failed, though the story of the grievances was believed, but the people hoped to secure redress from the Sovereign and Parliament. During the War India might have been a source of danger to the Empire, with its different culture and civilization, and color, "as you people are so fond of pointing out." The quarrel in Europe had not been their affair, in spite of what the people had been told. The feelings were suppressed

during the War, and found full vent at the close in the great outburst known as the Non-Co-operation movement led by Gandhi. Yet to that movement the people had not given full support. Its origin had been quite clear to all growing up before their very eyes.

"It was a rebellion, but a rebellion without arms in which the rebels threw away all arms, and declared they were not in rebellion to kill but to be killed, not to deprive anyone of liberty, but to be deprived of liberty. It was an extraordinary rebellion, the leader of which was a great moral man of purity of character, a man whose ideals challenged the admiration of the world, a man who thought that if he must conduct war he would conduct it as no war had ever been conducted. It was a spiritual struggle, difficult to deal with, and, after the European War, afforded a contrast. Why did our people not give sufficient force to Gandhi, whom they admired, and whose character they venerated? They said in actions, if not in words: 'We cannot afford to declare war against the British Government. We do not wish to undermine or destroy it. We should like to shake it a little, because it seems to be prouder than ever after the War, and we would like to show them what risks they are running, but we cannot afford to destroy this Government.'"

Some of Gandhi's followers had wanted him to declare a more active war, but he had refused, arguing that the average Britisher is a little slow and takes time to think, and perhaps if given a knock he would

begin to think, and possibly then grievances would be righted, and he could not believe that the Englishman meant to keep his people in servitude all the time.

Mr. Sastri said that the heart of India is still with the British Empire, and why? Not because they were any more idealists than the people of Canada. They did not love the British Empire because it was the British Empire. It was not love for love's sake. "We are selfish people the same as you, and have good keen political sense the same as you, and we know our interests lie rapped up in the British connection. That is why we wish to remain. It is a tremendous mistake to suppose loyalty for loyalty's sake, gratitude for gratitude's sake, love for love's sake ever kept a people true to a political connection. These things are good and valuable when material considerations bind them in certain directions, but let material considerations and moral considerations part company and neither by itself is sufficient to hold a political connection."

Mahatma Gandhi

In the course of an appreciative study of the character and genius of Mahatma Gandhi, Mr. Sastri wrote as follows in the pages of the Survey Graphic, an American magazine:—

POLITICS is not separable from life. Mr. Gandhi would not countenance the separation, for his great aim is to strip life of its sophistication and reduce it to its own nature—simple, rounded, pure. It merely happens that for the moment his activity is in the field of politics. It merely happens that for the moment he is confronting Government and daring its wrath. It merely happens that for the moment his cry of *Swara*j for India has caught the ear of the world and the world is anxious to know what his *Swara*j is. His real and final objective is a radical reform of human kind. His Gospel is "Back to Nature." He avows himself an implacable enemy of Western civilisation. In his mighty war against Western civilization *Swara*j for India is but a campaign. The rules of the campaign are the rules of the mighty war; the weapons to be used in the campaign are the weapons to be used in the campaign of the mighty war; the virtues to be evoked by the campaign are the virtues which will win the mighty war in the end. The cardinal rule of both, the war

and the campaign, is non-violence. Non-violence is of the heart as well as of the body. By thought, word and act you may not injure your adversary. Enemy in a personal sense is too strong a word for his dictionary. But as the adversary does not follow the rule you will be subjected to great suffering and loss. Rejoice in the suffering and loss and court them. If you cannot rejoice in them, do not avoid or complain against them. Love your enemies; if you love them, pardon them and never retaliate against them. Force is wrong and must go under. The soul is invincible; learn to exercise its full power. Hold to the truth at all costs; Satya triumphs in the end. Out of this cardinal rule, almost logically, proceed a number of principles which will keep us straight in the war and this campaign for Swaraj. Since Western civilization and the existing system of British Government have to be got rid of, we must have nothing to do with either offspring of Satan; we must cut off our connection with those large and powerful institutions by which they enslave us. These are schools, courts, legislatures. Withdraw children from schools, sue not for justice in courts, and avoid the polling-booth. Machinery being another invention of Satan and mills being the mainstay of British domination in India, boycott both, cease to import foreign cloth, and erect a spindle in each home. The motion of the *Charka* has mystic properties, its music chastens the soul, and its products most adorn the human form, especially the female form. These principles and

courses of action have more or less permanent validity because the war against modern civilization must be expected to be of indefinite duration. It is a picked body, however, namely, the members of the *Satyagrahasrama* in Ahmedabad—who are engaged in this exalted enterprise and owe lifelong allegiance to those principles and courses of action. The numerous levies now fighting in India under the flag of Non Co-operation are enrolled only for a single campaign and may lapse into the common grooves of life as soon as the British Government has been brought to its knees and consented to change its basis. In the intensive operations of this campaign it may become necessary to resort to civil disobedience of selected laws and non-payment of taxes. But wherever the severity of the measures which such action may provoke the authorities to adopt, Non-Co-operators are precluded from the slightest infraction of the commandment as to non-violence.

To understand Mr. Gandhi's view of life, attention must be fixed on the rules he has laid down for the regulation of his Ahmedabad institution. Its name, *Satyagrahasrama*, means the hermitage of the determined practice of truth or the abode of soul-force. The *Asrama* is still small. It has had no real chance of proving its vitality, for ever since its establishment other things have claimed the energies of its founder. But the attainment of its objects is conditioned by the increase of its numbers and the acceptance by the community at large of these austere

ideals as at present exemplified in the lives of a few apostles. No estimate can be formed of the prospective influence of the new gospel without an examination of its real nature.

Truth in the highest sense is possible only where the individual enjoys complete freedom. All forms of force or coercions are thus at once barred. Compulsion, authority, government, these are anathema marantha to one who at bottom is a philosophical anarchist. In fact, he describes the essence of his doctrine sometimes as love, sometimes as truth, sometimes as non-violence (ahimsa), these forms are in his opinion interchangeable: For organised government in the ideal world, is justifiable. The merit of the British Government is that it governs the least. Even a family and a school must trust entirely to the power of love and moral reasoning. Flagrant misconduct he deals with by himself fasting for a certain number of days, the guilty party being invariably brought to a state of contrition within that period. Sometimes ago he applied this remedy to end a serious strike in a mill, the employers coming to reason for fear of incurring sin. Within the last few weeks the violence practised by some persons in Bombay in the name of Non-Co-operation on the occasion of the Prince of Wales' visit entailed this form of self-chastisement on his part, and by all accounts it had the desired result.

Nobody is entitled to possess more than is absolutely necessary for the moment. To hold in excess

of the need is to be guilty of theft. He and his wife have given away all their property—he practised law for many years with success—and now own nothing beyond the clothes they wear and a change or two and may be a bag or box to contain these. The Asrama in Ahmedabad contains the barest necessities.

Each person must supply his wants by his own exertion. The ideal is to grow the corn that one eats and weave the cloth that one wears. Even the brain worker is not exempt from this bodily labour. In fact, the spindle has grown to be a fetish with Mr. Gandhi. Its music has a charm for him. He prescribes it for all men and women. Boys must prefer it to books. Lawyers must cast away their briefs for it. Doctors must abandon stethoscope and take to it.

So far its products have been coarse; but he asks, can a man or woman look more beautiful than in the Khaddar made by himself or herself? When a lady pupil of his wore the first Sari of her own making, he surveyed her and pronounced her divinely attractive. Without a doubt his eyes so saw her and his mind so judged her.

Control of the senses is a requisite of the first importance. It is very hard and can be only very slow. But it must be incessantly and ruthlessly practised. Luxuries are, of course, taboo. Even comforts must be steadily reduced. The plate is a particularly venal sense and has to be rigidly curbed. Simple hard fare is a condition of spiritual advance.

ment. Celibacy is also enjoined on the inmates of the Asrama. Married couples may not be admitted unless they agree to surrender their marital relation and adopt that of brother and sister. If Mr. Gandhi had his way he would recommend this course to mankind. The resulting extinction of the species has no terrors for him. He merely asks, why should we not all go to a better planet and live on a higher plane? The question would not appear so fantastic after all to one who believed in the re-birth of souls according to the law of Karma and remembered that no person would be a celibate except of his or her own free choice and when the sex passion had been transcended.

Machinery, being one of the most inseparable adjuncts of modern civilization, must be abandoned. It is of the kingdom of Satan. Mills and factories where the labourer is done out of his humanity, have no place in his scheme. The wealth they create, it needs no saying, is an abomination. Posts and telegraphs and railways are likewise condemned and with them goes the printing press. He says that every time he himself uses of these instruments of civilisation he does so with a pang. It would be nearly as hard for him to carry on his work without resort to them as it would be to escape from the atmosphere of the earth: but perhaps the use of evil might be defensible in its own destruction. Rapid and easy means of communication have but multiplied crime and disease. Could not man infer from the fact of

God having given him legs that he was not intended to go farther than they could carry him? What are ordinarily called the benefits of railway and similar things are in reality the opposite, being added enjoyments or means of gratifying the senses.

Medicine does not escape his judgment ; he calls it black magic and actually says it is better to die than be saved by a drug prescribed by the doctor. The fear of immorality and unhealthy modes of life has been materially weakened if not totally removed by the hope of being saved from the evil consequences by the help of the doctor. A return to the cure of nature and her simple ways would redeem mankind.

These and similar doctrines, which appear harsh to the ordinary person, form the substance of Mr. Gandhi's ethics. Let it not be supposed that they are logical abstractions formulated for the purposes of a moral treatise or sermon, and with no intended application to life. Their propounder practises them in the spirit and in the letter, and the limitations on their practice do not proceed from any tenderness for himself or his relatives. His renunciation of worldly goods has already been mentioned. He does not seek the medical man in sickness. He eats hard fare. He wears *Khaddar* woven by his own hands and in that dress and barefooted appears before the Viceroy of India. He knows no fear and shrinks from nothing which he advises others to do. In fact his love of suffering and hardship as a means of spiritual progress is almost morbid. His composure and tenderness are

infinite like the ocean, to use an eastern simile. The present writer stood by as he wiped the sores of a leper with the ends of his own garment. In fact it is his complete mastery of the passions, his realization of the ideal of a "sanyasin" in all the rigor of its eastern conception, which accounts for the great hold he has over the masses of India and has crowned him with the title of Mahatma or the Great Soul.

Now to a few other doctrines of a subordinate grade. Curiously enough he is a believer in the system of caste, though the pride of caste and its exclusiveness will receive no quarter from him. Apparently he is convinced of its beneficence, if maintained in its original purity, and holds it to be of the essence of Hinduism. In this belief, however, he is not likely to be followed by a great section of his countrymen, who are anxious to restore their religion to its ancient purity. But he is at one with them and in fact with the awakened conscience of India in desiring to exorcise the demon of untouchability. Millions of people are held by caste Hindus to be beneath their physical touch and live in conditions which are scarcely fit for human beings. These he would uplift, asserting that Hinduism gives no kind of justification for the abuse. But his work for the depressed classes, as they are called, would take the form which has quite recently been given to social work of that kind, in the West. He would have the worker cast aside his own status and live the life of the class to be helped, do their work and earn their

wage, exactly as they do. So only can real understanding and sympathy come, so only can that confidence be engendered which is an essential pre-requisite of all work of amelioration.

His Non-Co-operationist followers seem in places to have mixed up his humanitarian work with politics and so suffered a check. In the Mahatma's eyes no political rights will be of the slightest use to a community which is the prey of great social failings, and work for *Swara*j can never reach any success without simultaneous work for great social reforms. But violent political excitement is not a favourable condition, for such antagonism of government and its officials is only to be expected to the activities of hosts of young picketeers who are pledged at the same time to embarrass and even destroy the ordinary administration.

The educational ideals of the Mahatma have not yet received a clear expression. To compulsion even of rudimentary education he must be averse. The highest sciences and arts, the specialised forms, historical research or economic enquiry with their glorification of machinery and wealth in its varied forms, will find no room in his simple scheme. Of the necessity of introducing one language for common use in India he has been for long a persistent advocate. He has chosen Hindi for the place of the *lingua franca*. With characteristic earnestness he has collected funds for the purpose of spreading a knowledge of this language and has sent out

enthusiastic teachers to all parts of India. The Non-Co-operation turmoil may have for the time overshadowed this activity. Perhaps, too, the bulk of educational workers in India has not yet accepted the Mahatma's conclusions in this regard, and for this reason his efforts on behalf of Hindi have not been co-ordinated with the educational work of the country generally.

The writer of these lines is not of Mr. Gandhi's political followers or a disciple of his in religion. But he claims to have known him for some years and to have been a sympathetic student of his teachings. He has felt near him the chastening effects of a great personality. He has derived much strength from observing the workings of an iron will. He has learned from a living example something of the nature of duty and the worship due to her. He has occasionally caught some dim perception of the great things, that lie hidden below the surface and of the struggles and tribulations which invest life with its awe and grandeur. An ancient Sanskrit verse says:—"Do not tell me of holy waters or stone images; they may cleanse us if they do, after a long period. A saintly man purifies us at sight."

Speech at the Canadian Club.

Before leaving the shores of Canada, Mr. Sastri who was entertained at the Canadian Club, Toronto, made his farewell speech which was described as "a logically moving and fearlessly eloquent appeal."

I have come to Canada after visiting Australia and New Zealand with a commission from the Government of India. To-night I am delivering my last speech in Canada and I am leaving to-morrow. I should not be showing respect to the citizens of Hamilton if I evaded my direct duty and spoke on only a side issue which after all, can only be used as background against which to measure larger events. So I crave your indulgence for changing the programme.

DISCRIMINATION

You have in Canada 1,200 natives of India. Eleven hundred of them live in British Columbia, leaving only one hundred in all the other provinces, where there is no discrimination against them by law or otherwise, and they are treated as Canadian citizens. But in British Columbia they do not enjoy the full rights of Canadian citizenship. I have come to ask that that disability no longer be allowed to rest on them, but that they should be allowed, as British subjects, owing allegiance to the British crown and having demonstrated their loyalty, which is not inferior to that of any other part of the Empire, to exercise their rights, and that the people of British

Columbia and all who vote in the Dominion Parliament (you all have votes to the Dominion Parliament) should henceforth not make my fellow countrymen victims of any discriminating legislation.

NO FRANCHISE

They are not allowed to vote in municipal elections or for the Provincial Legislature in British Columbia, so by your election law they are excluded from voting for the Dominion Parliament. This is in virtue of the law of British Columbia. It is couched in these words: 'No Hindu (meaning by that all the inhabitants of India, which is incorrect) shall be allowed to vote, whether a British subject or not.'

I submit that the words 'whether a British subject or not' conveys a slight on every British subject and it ought not to stand in any legislation in the Empire. Any citizen of the Empire should be allowed all the rights and privileges of the Empire anywhere within the Empire.

A DANGEROUS THING

It is a dangerous thing to tell the world that citizens of the Empire are treated like strangers and foreigners within different parts of the Empire. If you permit a man to live among you, pay taxes and obey your laws you have no right to treat him as a poor, undesirable alien. It is very important that we tell the world that we embrace British subjects as brothers everywhere the Union Jack flies.

UNPLEASANT TRUTH

Those who framed that law against the natives

of India resident in British Columbia could not have envisaged the full meaning or felt the full glory of British citizenship. It is an unpleasant truth for me to utter, and doubtless for you to hear, but it is good for us to occasionally rake over our sins.

Why do I ask the franchise for the eleven hundred of my fellow-countrymen in Canada? Is it anything of importance to us in India, who are three hundred millions, whether they vote or not? Not in itself, but in the principle which has a deep and moral effect. In the first place it will teach the people of Canada, who require that little education, that they have no right to take away the rights of citizenship from fellow-citizens within the Empire. In the second place, it will teach millions in India that they have come by the fortunes of war under the decrees of Providence to dwell within an Empire where color, race, creed, birth, the mere origin of a man, is all an irrelevant consideration where the rights of citizenship are concerned. That's the lesson it is necessary for you to teach the Indian people. They have looked for it all these years and not found it. Ever since they came under British protection they have been taught by books, by papers, by the glorious English literature, by Parliamentary documents, by solemn pledges of royalty; they have been told a million times in every possible way a binding promise can be made, that the British Empire makes no distinction of race, color, religion, birth or condition of man.

Speech at the Royal Colonial Institute

A luncheon in honour of the Rt. Hon. Mr. Sastri was given by the Royal Colonial Institute on the eve of his return to London after completing the mission (entrusted to him by the Government of India) to Australia, New Zealand and Canada for the purpose of Conferences with their Governments and peoples relative to the status of Indians in these Dominions. The function was held at the Hotel Victoria, London on October 26, 1922 and was presided over by the Chairman of the Council, Sir Godfrey Lagden, K. C. M. G. Sir Godfrey in introducing Mr. Sastri said that few, if any, of Mr. Sastri's kinsmen have been so richly endowed with the character and qualifications for such a mission. "He has had a splendid record of public service. His capacity, his culture, his brilliant power of exposition, have combined to win for him respect and admiration—not only in India but in this country and the Dominions." He quoted with appreciation Mr. Hughes, the Australian Premier's parting letter to Mr. Sastri: "Your visit has been one of Imperial significance, and has afforded the people of Australia an opportunity of realizing something of the vastness and complexity of our Empire. Your presence here has been of itself an education to many amongst us. You have, by your admirable speeches and your presence, lifted the

curtain of prejudice and want of knowledge, and revealed to us something of India as it really is. You have educated public opinion inside and outside Parliament, and made that possible which before your visit was impossible."; and proposed the Toast of "Our Guest" in felicitous terms. Mr. Sastri in acknowledging the honour said :—

I AM delighted to be able to meet so many who are interested in the Empire, and in the problems of Empire, on this particular occasion. The Chairman has mentioned the special mission on which I was employed, and has enumerated the Dominions which I had recently the honour of visiting. But he did not say, what I am sure in his heart is a feeling of regret, that I did not visit the Dominion in which he is most interested, namely, South Africa. I share with him that regret. I was not prepared to go to South Africa, and if I may quote high authority, without mentioning names in this room, I was assured that for a good long time yet South Africa may not be in a state of moral and material preparedness to receive a Deputation of this kind from India. In the light of that information the Government of India magnanimously resolved not to take the Government of the Union of South Africa by surprise, for we hope to play the game. In the Dominions to which I did go, I was received with all the honours—all the hospitality due to a Representative of a great government belonging to the sisterhood of the British Empire. I found above all, what the Chairman has indicated,

that behind any measure of justice that might be recommended to the people there lies a background of mutual understanding and mutual goodwill which has to be present before any ameliorative measures can be undertaken. I believe my mission has helped to bring that background into vivid existence and actuality. More I did not expect. The immediate fulfilment of my object was not within the range of my expectations. I hoped only to lay the foundations of a good understanding between India and the Dominions, and I believe that to some extent I have achieved success. I found everywhere in the Dominions a readiness to understand the principles and ideals of Empire, which are those of justice, of equality, and of brotherhood. I found, moreover, what it takes personal touch fully to realize, what is often described as a prejudice against the Indian Community, is not so much a prejudice against their Race, or their Colour, as some economic apprehension that unrestricted advent into the Dominions might reduce the scale of wages and the standard of life, and might even affect the quality of the civilization which the people of the Dominions are so anxious to cherish and preserve. That is a lesson which was impressed on my mind, and which will enable me more sympathetically to understand the apparently hesitant attitude of the Dominions towards the people of India. When I presented the problem, not merely from the Indian standpoint, but as a measure of relief necessary in the interests of the Empire I found I struck a chord

which vibrated with a very lively response indeed. For the Empire is everywhere in the Dominions cherished to-day with an affection and a warmth of attachment, probably not reached at any time before in its history.

As you may all know, India accepts the compact of 1918, by which not merely she, but every Dominion and Partner in this Empire is free to regulate the composition of its own population by suitable immigration laws. That compact being there and India being a willing party thereto, my problem was easy. I presented it to the people of the Dominions as a case of justice towards the few who had already acquired a domicile amongst them, and whom therefore they were bound by every consideration, Imperial and Indian, to treat as equal subjects of His Majesty. To that appeal they turned a willing ear, and I am fairly certain it may not be long before the actual measure of legislation asked for will be put on the statute book of the various Dominions.

The Chairman was good enough in his speech to refer to the thought and the ambition of India, and to her place in the Britannic Commonwealth, and I think you will allow me to say just a few words in reference to that large topic. I am for the moment clothed with the character of a Representative of the Government of India, and although I am about to shed that character, it still clings to me, and to some extent embarrasses me. I cannot speak as I could speak if I were a free man, and I will not in the last days of my Office do anything which might cause

embarrassment to the Government which I have had the great privilege of representing for a time. A few general considerations, however, may be permitted to even one who is so handicapped. I find I have struck a most interesting time in English public affairs. You are now engaged in one of your periodical pastimes of pulling down one Government and setting up another. I wish other nations, as well as you, knew the secret of accomplishing a revolution in so unsanguinary and peaceful a manner. It is on these occasions that one sees human nature in England at its strongest. Most of you do not suffer now from a super-abundance of that quality called charity and goodwill, and you seem also to have emancipated yourselves almost completely from that state of political paralysis and prostration which is called love of your enemies. We in India who have laboured for Political Emancipation, whether under the banner of the Indian National Congress, or under the banner of the All-India Liberal Federation, have taken very good care that we should not be linked up with any of the political parties in this country.

Although to a great extent our political fortunes are dependent on the goodwill and the wisdom of the Government for the time being, we have not allowed ourselves to be carried away by too much dependence, or too much independence of any Government for the time being, but, whether there was a Conservative or a Liberal Government, we have always looked to it for the due fulfilment of obligations and duties under

pledges and promises which have been made, and the pursuit to the last stage of any policy adopted by the Government as a whole. In this expectation we have not often been disappointed. Now and then there have been back-slidings and vacillations in the pursuit of the policy established, but on the whole we have moved on, and he would be not only an untruthful but an unjust critic and historian who said that from England India had not received just recognition of her separate existence. But we live in somewhat stirring times. The unrest created by the War has not left India alone. There is in our country too a degree of ferment which reaches down to the very roots of our political life. Men are beginning to examine, as they never did before, the fundamentals of their faith, and you see now on all sides an expression of very diffident and very hesitant opinion as to the utility and final usefulness to India of the connexion of India with Great Britain. All such hesitation, doubt, and misgiving we must put an end to at the earliest possible opportunity. That has to be done at all costs. We say "Safety First" in everything—yes, in the conduct of the Government of India, Safety First should be your rule—safety to India and safety to the Empire—safety to the connexion between India and Great Britain. There are too many who identify this safety, which ought to be a large and comprehensive conception, with small and fleeting interests. There are some who no doubt deserve our sympathy and attention, who identify

this safety with the safety of the great services, especially the British portion of those services. Far be it from me to say a word in derogation of those services; they have done noble, brilliant, and unexampled service to India and the Empire, but we must remember that they are after all for India and for the Empire, and that India and the Empire are not for them. This is a sentiment which it should not be necessary for one solemnly to lay down upon such an occasion, were it not for the fact that indiscreet champions think and write as though that did not underline all our work in that connexion. There are those who think other matters, such as the remodelling of the Army and the re-establishment of the relations between the new Government and the Indian Princes and Potentates, ought to be considered. These difficulties there are—each one formidable in itself. But over and above all these things is that trust in the ideals of the Empire—that faith of the people of India that they are in the hands of a most benevolent Institution, under Providence—that faith and that trust which are the true foundations of British rule in India and which must be maintained before anything else can be thought of. In the last few days I have been talking to many people of influence in British politics. I am somewhat surprised at their constantly saying, “What is the best thing to do?” There is no doubt whatever that a wise man always considers what is the best thing to do, but in human affairs, although

some of us may see clearly, far off, what is the best thing to do, we must not forget that sometimes we may be hustled and forced, and while we abstain from taking the second best course, in order to take the ideal best course, it often happens we are overpowered by circumstances we have not foreseen, and with sorrow we have to take a third or fourth course which may involve us, and everybody, in utter confusion.

So my very humble request to people of influence here is—do not with folded arms think too much of what is the best thing to do but if necessary do the second best in good time, and you will find in the long run that that was perhaps the best thing in the circumstances. Then there are others who say, “But where are we? Have you committed yourselves to any definite policy?” It was clear I think to everyone that Great Britain was committed irrevocably in 1919 to the grant of responsible government to India. It is therefore to India a matter of grave concern now and again to read a speech delivered by a Statesman of Cabinet rank which questions the whole thing as if it had not been settled, as if Parliament had not committed itself to it, and as if Royalty over and over again had not pledged its solemn word to the accomplishment of these high aims. Nothing remains now but to go forward in confident and high-hearted endeavour, and he would be a great benefactor both to India and Great Britain who could ensure the cessation of doubt and misgiving at every turn.

Your face is set in a certain direction ; there is no more room for doubt. You are like a man who in a crowded thoroughfare in London leaves the pavement after a good deal of hesitation to dash forward. It is not wise to stop in the middle of the road and look round, to see whether one man is going forward or going back. Great Britain is pledged to the hilt, and he does a disservice to her who still hesitates in the accomplishment of this good and high mission. The Government of India Act of 1919 gave us an avowedly transitory measure, which was intended to develop automatically into the status of responsible Government. We all know that in human affairs the most trying time is when you move from one institution to another. The period of conflicting aims, of unsettled duties, of divided responsibility, looking backward and forward at the same time, is one of friction and disagreeable contact between all concerned in the work of Government. Subject to the sovereign requirement "Safety First," our duty is to terminate as soon as possible this trying period of transition. That is work which the great services, which Imperial Statesmen, and which Indian Statesman have all to bend their energies to—the work of bridging this period of transition, so that India may take her place alongside the Dominions as equal partner in the British Commonwealth. There are many who think that this work of transition will take a long time, and there are many whom I have heard in the last few days who

say that the lessons of the War have not yet been sufficiently learned in England, and that perhaps this work of transition may not be carried out in peace, and without disorder and trouble of a serious character. They ask "When in history has a nation ever achieved independence without revolution? Where in the history of the British Empire has self-government come to any Dominion without serious disorder?" Canada, which began the story of Colonial Emancipation, had her days of disorder. Now that is a point where I wish to say, for my part and on behalf of the party in India to which I belong, that we believe that the ideals of the British Empire will still be realised by peaceful and constitutional means, and although history so far may point one way, perhaps it is open to England and to India to write a fresh chapter in the history of the world. May the chapter be Home Rule by peaceful methods. I sincerely trust that this aim of responsible Government for India will be constantly borne in mind by those who control public affairs in India, and in England; that in spite of many distractions, you will not allow yourselves by doubt or misgiving to be deflected from your high aim, and that you will allow India, in conjunction with Whitehall and Downing Street, under the guidance of Great Britain, to achieve her destiny as a member of the Britannic Commonwealth, and to contribute something to the civilization of which the British Empire is the guardian, and I hope the guarantee for evermore.

Address to the Liberal Federation

The following is the full text of the Rt. Hon. Sastri's Presidential Address to the Fifth Session of the National Liberal Federation of India held at Nagpur on Dec. 27, 1922 :—

LIBERAL organizations all over India have conferred on me a very great honour and I am profoundly grateful. The conduct of your deliberations at this session is a delicate as well as a difficult task. Some friends have written to tell me of their expectations and would be surprised perhaps to be told they have not exactly heartened me. I shall have rejoiced sincerely if your attempt to secure another President and a worthier one had succeeded. My friend Dr. Tej Bahadur Sapru has qualifications for the position, natural and acquired, to which I cannot lay claim. The Liberal party's bad luck had ordained that his release from official bondage should come a few days too late. And I am here. I am willing to serve. Make the best of me you can.

First let us pay a tribute of affectionate memory to those of our friends who have passed away in recent months from the scenes that knew them well. Dewan Bahadur C. Karunakara Menon, after many years' faithful and highly appreciated labour in the field of journalism, died in his native district in

honourable poverty. The political views of Babu Motilal Ghose and his quaint manner of expressing them gave him during nearly two generations a place all his own in the public life of our country. We shall long miss the amiable figure of Dr. Sir Balchandra Krishna, somewhat rare in recent years on our platform, but one of the heroes of the past generation, of wise and weighty eloquence and not easily swayed by passion or prejudice. The loss of Sir Vithaldas Damodar Thackersey is a grief from which we shall take very long to recover. His knowledge of business, courage in advocacy and restraint of expression gave his pronouncements uncommon weight in the Assembly. A debate in the old Imperial Council when it still sat in Calcutta is among my vivid memories, in which he vigorously and skilfully assailed the railway policy as to rates, while Mr. Gokhale sitting near him beamed approval and encouragement. The Bombay Legislative Council is the poorer for the death of Rao Bahadur G. K. Sathe, whose clear common sense and quiet speech made his counsel invaluable both to those who sit on the official benches and to their critics.

MR. MONTAGU

On this occasion, when the Liberal party in India meets for the first time after the recent political changes in England, our thoughts go naturally to the Right Honourable E. S. Montagu. In the long history of our British connection, no one has loved India more, no one has suffered more for her.

no one has been more courageous or persistent in the application to her of the noble principles of Liberalism, no one amongst front-bench politicians in England has had a more thorough or sympathetic knowledge and appreciation of her problems or her ambitions, no one has had a higher conception of her destiny within the British Commonwealth, and no one has put together a more substantial record of actual achievement in the pursuit of that destiny. We all regretted very much the sinister intrigue which deprived him of office, and we regret still more those cross currents of English politics which have resulted in his exclusion from Parliament altogether. What a loss it is in these days, when there is reasonable fear of reaction or stagnation of Indian affairs! Though in opposition, his voice would have carried more moral weight than that of any other single member of the House and his guidance would have been of rare authority. India thinks of him with sorrow made poignant by her gratitude and sends him her best wishes for a future career worthy of his great services to India and to the British Commonwealth.

SIGNS OF REACTION

The Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for India and certain other politicians of note have declared their intentions not to go back on the policy of the Government of India Act, 1919, and to abide loyally by its provisions in spirit as well as in the letter. This doubtless brings some relief to the anxi-

ous mind of India, and we trust that the strength of the Labour party in Opposition and of the Liberal party, will be sufficient to avert any tendency to reaction which the presence in the new Ministry of some well-known opponents of the Government of India Act might lead us to apprehend. Our friends in England, of whom, to the honour of British public life, there never has been a want, hold out no great hope of any advance under the present regime. Those who have experience from the inside of actual administration in India already detect pronounced symptoms of a tendency on the part of the India Office, while observing the letter of the law, to violate it in the spirit. The more acute section of the general public here, only too ready to imbibe a note of pessimism, profess to be startled by an attitude of entrenched confidence on the part of the Imperial services quite at variance with their uneasy apprehensiveness of a little while ago. Speaking in May last to an audience composed almost entirely of high officials, I took the risk of being accused of impertinence, warned them solemnly that there was a very wide spread distrust of their good faith in the matter of political reforms in the country and implored them not to be too solicitous of the maintenance of vested interests, but to proceed with high hearts in the work of preparing India for Dominion status, giving continual proof of a recognition on their part that that was their one high mission and purpose here. So cautious and just-minded a man as Sir Sivaswamy

Aiyar has recently given expression in the columns of the *Nineteenth Century and After* to similar sentiments. I will make no apology for quoting some sentences from his weighty pronouncements: "It, i.e., the unrest, is largely due to a complete loss of faith in the minds of large sections of the people in the sincerity of the declarations and promises of the Government, and in their sense of justice. Belief in the justice of the British Government has been the most valuable asset of British rule in the past. The result of Mr. Gandhi's agitation has been to undermine this belief. It is this distrust of the Government which is largely responsible for the disbelief of many educated men in the reality of the constitutional reforms, and which has induced them to become extremists and resort to the method of Non-Co-operation with all its pernicious consequences. The most pressing problem, in my opinion, is how to restore the faith of the people in the good intentions of the Government."

When I was in England last year I heard a member of the Cabinet deplore a political mishap and add that it could have been avoided if the men on the spot had given timely warning of the magnitude of the danger that was gathering head. The remark struck me at the time as a rather forcible reminder of the duty of all public men, non-official as well as official, to speak out in critical times without fear and without reserve. Doubtless some men in authority will resent candid speech and denounce it as a threat,

but that is a risk that must be faced by those who would save communities from injury and statesmen from blunders. It is in this spirit that I venture now to survey broadly and briefly the present political situation.

INDIANISATION OF THE SERVICES

The new constitution of India has been designed as a first step towards responsible government. It transfers to the control of elected representatives of the people certain departments of public business, while it enhances the influence of those representatives over the remaining departments. The British element in the public services has been told that it will diminish continuously in the future, and that, while it lasts, its function is to train people in self-rule. British officials must now be prepared to be judged by the care and solicitude with which they discharge this last duty. They have, it must be allowed, a more vivid appreciation of the difficulties and complexities of self-rule. They must know that, while Parliament can pass an Act and sanction a few rules, the actual transfer of political power has to be effected in this country in a multitude of matters more or less large, and that they must not lose a day or an opportunity in giving to the children of the soil every possible facility for learning how to work parliamentary institutions in their entire range. While the statute prescribes that after ten years a commission should be appointed to examine and report how far further progress is possible, the executive in India are expected in the interval not to mark time or refuse sullenly to move, but to

do everything short of Parliamentary legislation to keep the good work going. Let us take, in the first instance, what is put down in the forefront of the preamble to the Act, *viz.*, the increasing association of Indians in every branch of the public service. Before the declaration of policy of August 1917, the position of Indians in the public services had been the subject of one of the bitterest complaints against British administration. After the Act, one would expect the association of Indians in every branch of the public service to proceed with marked speed. Some time ago, instead of declaring in conformity with the abovementioned policy what the minimum proportion of the British element should be for the time being and leaving the balance to be filled up by statutory Indians, the old principle was continued of dividing the cadre in British and Indian proportions, as though it were a common patrimony, and the Indians were to be limited to a percentage of 48 which was to be reached in ten years from an immediate beginning of 33 per cent. This 33 per cent. is on the annual recruitment. Before the Indian element would actually reach 33 per cent. of the whole service, it would be 20 to 25 years. When that element attains to 48 per cent. it would be about 30 to 35 years. Already interested people fill the air in Britain and in India with the cry that the Indian element is growing alarmingly and dangerously large. The famous O'Donnell circular asserts that the proportion of Indians to the total cadre is to-day only

12 per cent. We are thus enabled to see the slender basis on which alarmist forecasts of the destruction of the steel frame are based. It is such unfounded representations, repeated in the English Press over Anglo-Indian signatures, which are to a great extent responsible for the growing unpopularity of the Indian services, and which friends of India like Lord Meston, Sir Claude Hill and Sir Valentine Chirol find it so difficult to counteract. Now my question is, Is the Indian patriot generally and the elected member in particular of our new Legislatures content with this rate of Indianisation of the great Civil Service? On the contrary, is it not a most depressing and disheartening indication of the intolerably long delay in the attainment of full responsible government, which it is the apparent intention of the authorities to cause in so far as it is in their power? When we think in addition of the overpowering consideration of economy, we are disposed to grudge every single year of this delay.

I wish to take you somewhat deeper into this question of Indianisation. Now by the very hypothesis of the case an important aspect of Indianisation is the admission of qualified Indian members of the Service into those branches of administration where they would be trained in the inner art of government and initiated into its secrets. No better test could be devised of the sincerity of the authorities in their desire to obey the requirements of the preamble to our Act than the extent to which they have appointed

Indians to the Secretariat of the Government of India and the various Local Governments. The following table gives the necessary figures for comparison :—

TABLE I.

Government of India.

Secretaries (including Joint Secretaries)	13	1 Indian
Deputy Secretaries	... 13	3 Indians
Under Secretaries	... 5	1 Indian
	<hr/> 31	<hr/> 5

TABLE II.

Local Governments.

	Secretaries	Dy. Secy's.	Under Secy's.	Indians.
Assam ...	4	0	2 (1 Indian)=	6 1
Bengal ...	9	2	2	=13 Nil
B. & O. ...	6 (1 Indian)	0	5 (2 Indians)=	11 3
Bombay ...	9	6 (1 Indian)	3 (1 Indian)=	18 2
C. P. ...	3	0	3 (2 Indians)=	6 2
Madras ...	8 (1 Indian)	1	7 (6 Indians)=	16 7
Punjab ...	7 (1 Indian)	0	10 (1 Indian)=	17 2
U. P. ...	9 (1 Indian)	4	5 (3 Indians)=	18 4

55 (4 Indians) 13(1 Indian) * 37 (16 Indians)=105 20

* N. B. Including figures for the P. W. D. also.

If it be urged that Indians of sufficiently long standing are not available, the following table will supply the means of testing the contention.

TABLE III.

Indian Officers of	5 years	10 years	15 years	20 years & up,
Assam ...	1	1	1	1
Bengal ...	4 (1)	0	1	1
B. & O. ...	3	0	1	..
Bombay ...	1	1	3	1
C. P. ...	2 (1)	1	1	2
Madras ...	1	2	1	4
Punjab ...	1	1	1	2
U. P. ...	6 (2)	2	4	4
	<hr/> 19 (4)	<hr/> 8	<hr/> 13	<hr/> 15

This table shows that there are at least 19 Indian officers available for Under-Secretaryships

under the Government of India, 8 officers for Deputy-Secretaryships, 13 for Joint or Deputy-Secretaryships and 15 for Secretaryships, and memberships of the Executive Councils, etc. Assuming that there had been no declaration of policy in 1917 and no action consequent thereupon, these figures would disclose grounds for the belief that Indians had not had a fair chance given to them of acquiring Secretariat experience. Judged in the light of that declaration and the preamble to the Act, the authorities responsible for the selection of Secretariat personnel will find it hard to prove that they have done their duty. While a tilting of the balance in favour of Indians might be justified and even required in view of the future, they are not getting even their due. How ridiculously wide of the mark is the cry of interested parties that Ministers choose their officers on grounds of favouritism !

THREATENED INCREASES IN SALARIES.

I have never been slow to sing the praise of the Indian Civil Service. I admire their high record, and I am thankful, deeply and sincerely thankful, for the way in which they have built up the administration of India on firm, efficient and thorough lines and given us, what perhaps we might not be able to evolve for ourselves, a whole body of auxiliary and subordinate services characterised by a fair degree of integrity, discipline and usefulness. I am not quite fitted by my birth or upbringing to judge of the pecuniary circumstances of well-placed officials, but some recent

observation in England and the Dominions inclines me to concede that there is much in the contention that in the case of those who have to maintain establishments in India and outside, salaries, even though improved slightly, are not the same as they were some years ago. At the same time I am one of those who hold firmly that the claims, however legitimate in one sense, of high-salaried employees of the State are by no means comparable in justness or urgency to those of employees in receipt of modest salaries. Further I contend that their claims to relief are sternly limited and may be completely negated by the low condition of public finance and the intolerable burden on a notoriously poor tax-payer. On purely economic considerations, therefore, it seems to me that, if further recruitment in Britain is possible only on a greatly increased scale of salaries, allowances, and emoluments of one kind or another, the representatives of the people in our Legislative Assembly will be compelled, with much reluctance, to recommend a cessation or at least a substantial abatement of such recruitment. No commission, however authoritative, can reconcile us to increased impositions on account of the British services. Moreover, British prestige and the continuance of relations of mutual friendship and confidence between the races alike require that none but the best products of British culture should be brought hereafter to fill positions of influence and responsibility alongside of the best men turned out of our Universities. More

than once before we have made the costly mistake of supposing that to increase the attractions of the services is necessarily to improve the quality of recruits. I am aware that during the last two years the number of British competitors at the Civil Service Examination has diminished considerably, and in consequence the recruitment has been greatly in favour of the Indian element. Some further experience is necessary before we can determine how far this alteration is permanent. It seems to me anyhow the equity of the case would give to the children of the soil the benefit of any unforeseen conditions that operate in their favour.

ORDER REGARDING THE I. M. S.

A recent cablegram gives the disquieting news that the Secretary of State for India has appointed or is about to appoint to the Indian Medical Service 30 men on terms of special advantage, and I have read in some newspapers that this action of the Secretary of State is heralded by the termination of the services of Indians that have been taken temporarily during the war. While I was in England, I heard that a proposal of the Government of India, that in consideration of the difficulty of attracting British recruits ten appointments should be conferred on these temporary incumbents, was turned down by the India Office. I make these statements for what they are worth. I have not verified them. But one would like to know on what recommendations of the Government of India the Secretary of State's recent addition to the burdens of India is

based. Our case is that the retention of the Indian Medical Service on its present footing has the effect of treating the Civil medical needs of India as though they were completely subservient to the requirements of the Military and that it constitutes not only a serious hardship on the independent medical profession in India, but an artificial bar to the advance of medical research in this country. Champions of this service have not improved their case by resting it in great part on the necessity of providing qualified European medical assistance to the European services of the country. These latter services would on that view become in the popular eye even more burdensome than they are. It is quite true that under the statute the Secretary of State in Council has power to determine such matters; and the Indian Medical Service is placed in a specially privileged position by Rule 12 of the Devolution Rules: "A local Government shall employ such number of Indian Medical Service officers in such appointments and on such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary of State in Council." But the mere possession of power will not justify any and every use of it. The Indian Legislative Assembly has certain financial powers and would be quite justified under provocation in employing them so as to embarrass the Government. I much fear that if the 30 appointments are made by the Secretary of State to the Indian Medical Service on the conditions named, no one can foretell what the Assembly will do to safe-

guard the tax-payer's interests. It is difficult to imagine a representative House anywhere in the world sitting still and watching the nation's resources squandered with so little justification while the Central Government and most Local Governments lay under the nightmare of financial bankruptcy. How entirely without initiative we are here in India is proved by the statement made the other day by Sir Ludovic Porter in the U. P. Council that the Retrenchment Committee of that Province could not even consider the case of the Imperial Services without special leave of the Secretary of State.

CONTROL OF THE SERVICES

Before I leave the subject of the services, there is one suggestion which I commend to the acceptance of the Liberal Federation. The point occurred to me rather forcibly when we were considering the provisions of the Government of India Bill before the meeting of the Joint Select Committee. There is no government in the world of the magnitude and importance of that of India whose employees down to those drawing salaries of 400 and 500 rupees are chosen for them, punished and dismissed by superior authority. The anomaly, why the humiliation of it, was made glaringly manifest when, in a measure conferring Self-government on the people of India, the provision was repeated that all the Imperial services were to be recruited by the Secretary of State and that their salaries, pensions, allowances, &c. were to be regulated by

him and were exempted from the vote of the Legislative Assembly consisting of a great majority of elected members and supposed to be endowed with the power of sanctioning, reducing, or refusing money grants at the time of the annual budget. It is highly honourable to the discipline and the sense of propriety of these services as a whole that they have remained amenable to the control of the Governor-General-in-Council or the Governor-in-Council, though these cannot dismiss them. It is difficult, however, for Ministers and Indian Executive Councillors to command the same willing homage and co-operation from the great body of these services. It seems to me that the time is come when we must demand that the Governor-General of India in Council should take the place of the Secretary of State for India in Council in all matters relating to the Indian Civil Service and other Imperial services, the High Commissioner for India entering into covenants, dealing with the Civil Service Commissioners and doing other functions in this connection as the agent of the Government of India. Of course the statute would have to be altered and many rules and regulations modified accordingly. But the dignity and authority of the Government of India must be recognized and the Secretary of State for India, who is entirely out of touch with Indian sentiment and can defy it with impunity, removed from the position of supremacy which he now occupies with regard to the great services.

This proposal would seem to be incongruous with the plea advanced here for provincial autonomy. In fact certain provinces have already begun to clamour for the complete provincialization of the Services hitherto recruited in England and called Imperial. Without doubt that is the proper ideal, but there are cases in which what is logical is not necessarily sound and this is one such. I cannot do more than mention the principal grounds on which I recommend this half-way-house arrangement. In some provinces appointments are regulated on communal considerations while it is necessary that the higher services should be on grounds purely of merit and efficiency. Narrow political considerations would interfere with the bestowal of patronage far more in the provinces than at the centre. It is desirable that provincial barriers should not be recognised in the recruitment of the higher services, so that the unity of India may be maintained in this striking way. The public spirit and civic virtues of a people are largely influenced by the character of the services which must deteriorate under political influences.

Let me likewise recall the disappointment of the public that the experiment of appointing an Indian to one of the Governorships was abandoned so soon as the man of first choice vacated his office. It is doubtless true unfortunately that the name of any conceivable Indian would have been received with disapprobation by the ill-tempered section of the Press. The same remark would apply to the post of High Com-

missioner for India. But this circumstance should not be taken advantage of by a high-minded Government anxious to associate competent Indians in every branch of the public service.

While on the subject of high appointments I must deprecate the practice that now seems to have established itself of shifting Governors from one province to another. Some years ago strong disapproval was expressed of the appointment of High Court Judges to the Executive Government. It seemed as though the authorities agreed to the general principle. But curiously enough an Executive Councillor at the end of his term was appointed High Court Judge. Now holders of these high appointments must not be taught to expect further favours, and the people of every province are entitled to expect that their affairs would be administered by one who is above fear or favour.

THE ARMY

The Army question, however, is the test of tests for the *bona fides* of the British Government. Its urgency arises from two considerations, either of them strong in itself, but both together of paramount and overpowering force. The first consideration is financial, it being indisputable that the straitened state of Indian finance is due in great part to the inordinately bloated expenditure on the Army. The Indian Government are genuinely alarmed and besides affording full information to the Assembly and seeking their advice they have also forwarded to Eng-

land with their own recommendations the findings of a strong and representative Committee which were calculated to effect certain economies immediately and also reduce the total cost of the Army by gradually Indianising the commissioned ranks and reducing the British part of the Army. Nobody can tell with certainty at what stage these urgent proposals and recommendations lie in England, but it is rumoured that the Army authorities, who have the last say in the matter, have not been moved even by India's direst necessity. The other aspect of the matter goes even more to the root. Dominion status, which has been promised to India, is not possible in its fullest sense without the means of self-defence. It is true she pays every anna of the stupendous cost of the Army and in that way fulfils, nay more than fulfils, the conditions embodied in a resolution of the House of Commons of the 4th March, 1862: "That this House (while fully recognising the claims of all portions of the British Empire to Imperial aid in their protection against perils arising from the consequences of Imperial policy) is of opinion that Colonies exercising the right of Self-government ought to undertake, the main responsibility of providing for their own internal order and security, and ought to assist in their own external defence." An unexampled policy of suspicion, however, has hitherto denied the inhabitant of India admission to the King's Commission, with the result that, even if Indianisation began to-day on the most

generous and thorough-going scale and were prosecuted without intermission in the most honest spirit, it would take 25 to 30 years to complete the process. One hears that the proposals now before the authorities would spread the process over something like 35 years, and that even these are likely to prove unacceptable. Was Mr. Montagu gifted with prophetic insight when on the 5th December, 1919, at the last stage of the Government of India Bill he warned the House of Commons in a memorable passage? "Do not," he said "deny to India Self-government because she cannot take her proper share in her own defence and then deny to her people the opportunity of learning to defend themselves". This odious combination of insult and injury was paralleled only in India till the other day by the denial of representative institutions to her people on account of their illiteracy and resistance at the same time to all attempts to introduce a system of compulsory elementary education. The stagnation that has overcome the proposals of the Government of India with a view to retrench expenditure of the Army and Indianise the officer ranks is the most serious indictment of the intentions of the British authorities, and one does not see how the charge can be refuted. The delay aggravates anti-British feeling every day, and a loyal citizen feels it his duty to sound a serious note of warning and trusts that it will not be construed as threat. The idea that self-defence is an inseparable

attribute of Dominion autonomy is a theory of recent growth. In its early stages what was required was that the expenditure should be borne by the self-governing colony, a condition which has always been fulfilled by India. I believe British troops were not withdrawn from the Transvaal till several years after it had received Self-government. No doubt the inauguration of the Irish Free State has been followed within a short time by the withdrawal of the last English garrison. But this precedent cannot be applied in its rigidity to India, where the citizen has long been denied the right to bear arms or to exercise any but the most insignificant command in the so-called Indian Army. If the civil side of Dominion Status is practicable in this country much before the military side, the anomaly is the direct consequence of the narrow policy pursued by Britain hitherto; and during the period that the Indianisation of the Army takes place the British Army here must agree to defend the country, though it be governed by a civil power not of its own nationality. There is no inherent necessity for the transfer of the civil power to wait on, or be measured by, the transfer of military power. At any rate Great Britain is under a moral obligation not to insist on any close concomitance between the two.

INDIANS OVERSEAS

I had intended after my speeches concerning my Dominion tour not to refer to the subject of Indians Overseas in this speech. But certain events that are

taking place around us render it advisable that I should express my feelings on the subject as clearly as possible. British Guiana and Fiji have recently been visited by Commissions appointed by our Government. Considering their personnel, I am inclined to await with confidence the publication of their recommendations. Great interest attaches to the colony of Kenya, where the relations between the white settlers and our countrymen are so strained that influential men in London throw up their hands in despair. The white settlers in whose composition as a rule greed and pride seem to be combined to an intense degree cannot brook the idea of equality with Indians and threaten violence if a system based on equality were forced on them. Our people are equally determined to take nothing less than equality. I heard good accounts of General Coryndon, the new Governor of Kenya, but it is doubtful that he can do much. It is surprising that after two or three years of struggle the Colonial Office should abdicate its function as it were, and the Duke of Devonshire proclaim that he would support the man on the spot. It is difficult to interpret properly a meagre cablegram, but the principles involved and our interests at stake alike require that we should not put our trust too much in the personal idiosyncrasies of the man on the spot, whom an arrogant and overgrown community may coerce in many ways. If the Imperial Cabinet of Great Britain find themselves unable, owing to the truculence of white colonists, to carry out the resolution of

1921, it is an impressive lesson to other communities in the Commonwealth that what prevails at the seat of Empire is neither justice nor the sanctity of resolutions, but a threat of force. Even in the history of British India an episode or two have happened in which the European community have gone immoderate lengths in defence of unjust privilege and monopoly. In French Canada the establishment of responsible government was accompanied in 1849 by an outbreak on the part of the English malcontents which ended in the burning down of the House of Parliament and a personal insult to the Earl of Elgin, Her Majesty's representative. A sentence may be quoted from his despatch on the subject and commended to the Colonial Minister and his man on the spot. "Meanwhile it is my firm conviction that if this dictation be submitted to, the Government of this province by constitutional means will be impossible, and that the struggle between overbearing minorities backed by force and majorities resting on legalities and established forms, which has so long proved the bane of Canada, driving capital from the province and producing a state of chronic discontent, will be perpetuated."

With regard to the self-governing Dominions, the Bombay Corporation and Indian Chamber of Commerce have passed resolutions expressive of impatience at the way in which they treat the just rights of our countrymen. Apparently these bodies think that we had best retaliate at present. I have more than a suspicion that this is exactly what the

shrewd anti-Asiatic would desire. In fact I was asked by a representative of South Africa last year in London: "If we hit you hard, why don't you hit us hard in return? We have agreed to the principle of reciprocity." They know that the number of their nationals resident in India is so small as to be negligible, and that our retaliation therefore cannot amount to much. On the other hand if we did retaliate, we should have shot our last arrow, our opponents might cry quits. I am sure our nationals domiciled abroad will not thank us in the end, for we shall have lost the moral advantage we now possess in urging their claims. Moreover, in the three Dominions that I have visited I see no insuperable barrier in the way of our people similar to that which by all accounts exists in South Africa. Our people in Australasia or Canada have not organised themselves and made a demand for equality. In fact they are incapable without aid from us of a sustained struggle for their rights. Active Indian propaganda is the one condition of ultimate success. Without such it is unwise to expect just treatment or become angry when it is denied. We have just made one attempt at direct negotiation and, though I say so, not without some success. I submit it is too soon to give up hope.

THE WORKING OF REFORMS.

Let me now turn to a review of the earlier events under the new constitution. They were full of promise and gave cause for gratulation. Officials were cordial and courteous, non-officials were

willing to learn and full of consideration for the needs of the executive. Both alike were keen on the success of the Reforms. In several provinces the Governors forgot diarchy and treated the two halves of Government as one undivided Cabinet. The new legislatures, under the double blight of Non-Co operation and financial bankruptcy, faced their tasks with a courage and sagacity which promised well for the future of political India. On the Central Government, contrary to expectation, the interest of India centred. The Legislative Assembly thought consisting of representatives from diverse parts of India discharged its duties like a tried body of legislators and won the approbation not only of their President but of impartial observers generally. The official members too for their part showed a spirit of tolerance and helpfulness which did them great credit. Rules and regulations were interpreted in a liberal spirit, and the Assembly were invited to discuss the Military Budget and other proposals as though they had not been excluded from their scope. A strong committee of that body also sat on military matters generally and produced a unanimous report which did not make heroic recommendations, but which even so lies unheeded on the shelves of the War Office. On a resolution on Indian autonomy the Home Member, Sir William Vincent, thought it necessary to adopt a conciliatory attitude and himself proposed an amendment which, being accepted by the Assembly without a dissentient, committed that

body, including the members of Government, to the view that the question of further constitutional reform should not be allowed to wait till the ten-year limit had expired. Again, on a motion regarding the rapid Indianisation of the services the same spokesman of Government treated the question from a detached and sagacious point of view and agreed to institute immediate inquiries as to how to secure increased recruitment of Indians to the all-India services. With regard to those sections in the Act which represented the vestige of autocracy, endowing the Governor-General and the Governors, acting sometimes singly and sometimes with their Councils, with extraordinary powers of overriding their legislatures, one must admit that on the whole there has been little cause for public dissatisfaction. Such exercise happened only in two or three instances in the provinces and passed off quietly. It is well-known that the Governor-General of India in Council recently resisted great pressure brought to bear on him to resort to the process of certification in connection with the Budget. His forbearance till last September must be mentioned with especial thankfulness, because it has had the somewhat unexpected effect of enhancing the prestige of the Indian Parliament. It will be remembered that it was contemplated to leave the Government of India in the possession of undisputed and indisputable authority and that this authority should be frequently and as a matter of course asserted. The institution, however, of two Houses of Legislature,

one with an overpowering and the other with a decided elected majority, has made the exercise of overriding powers a matter of such grave risks that it was possible for the Assembly by judicious restraints upon its own conduct to have allowed the autocratic sections to remain inoperative for a long period, and then it might have been comparatively easy to ask for the repeal of the obnoxious sections. From a popular point of view it is regrettable that with regard to the Princes Protection Bill one of these sections has been utilized. On the merits of the question, I should say the enactment of the measure was unnecessary. On the other hand, it is open to question, with the clear sight which comes after the event, whether the Assembly was wise to refuse leave for the Bill to be introduced. It was and is to our interest that if the Governor-General has recourse to these sections, he does so in cases in which a detached observer would say that the Assembly had behaved with moderation and self restraint and given the Executive no justification or excuse for out of the way procedure.

DIARCHY.

To go back to the main line of thought, I was saying that, though the original idea had been to give the popular voice no real controlling power, the forbearance of the Executive had in practice given the Indian Parliament a fair measure of real control over the policy and measures of administration. In my accounts of our new constitution and its working

during my recent tour, I have always emphasised this unintended effect and claimed for the authors of the Government of India Bill that they builded better than they knew. To the higher officials concerned in the working of the new regime, I have given full meed of praise for their friendly and liberal attitude. I used to mention Sir Harcourt Butler in particular as a striking instance not only of ability, but of that rare sense of discipline which is one of the high qualities of the Indian Civil Service and which enables its members cheerfully and faithfully to carry out policies of which, however, they may not personally approve. Sir Harcourt, far from favouring the original Montagu-Chelmsford proposals, had fathered a rival scheme and pushed it as far as he could. Nevertheless, when called upon to administer the Act, which he had strenuously opposed, he was regarded as one of its truest interpreters.

But has this great chapter closed? Are we no longer a happy family? Have the authorities begun to weary of well-doing? Are they pulling themselves back? One would not like to believe so, but there are disquieting portents which may not be overlooked, and they proceed from a quarter where, while Mr. Montagu was in office, Indian interests never failed to find a champion. One of the cardinal principles laid down by the Joint Select Committee on the Government of India Bill was that, when the Legislature and the Executive were in agreement on any matter not involving Imperial interests, there

should be no interference from higher authority. Fiscal autonomy, to the extent that we now enjoy it, is regarded as a special application of this principle. During the discussions of 1919 it was regarded as of the utmost importance, and in the period of transition public opinion in India must jealously safeguard it from violation by the Secretary of State in the case of the Government of India or by the Government of India in the case of the Local Governments. Some months ago in another connection I had occasion to praise Mr. Montagu for the way in which he was willing to let the autonomy of India develop even at the cost of some self-suppression, and I have heard him say, with humorous exaggeration, that his ambition was very soon to abolish himself. Could it be said that the India Office respects this principle sufficiently? I read the other day a long string of matters of apparent agreement between the Government of India and the Indian Legislature either negatived or held up at Whitehall—the recommendations as to military expenditure, proposals for Indianising the Army, proposals for diminishing recruitment in England to the All-India services, proposals for appointing Indians to the Indian Medical Service, proposals in regard to Frontier policy and the recommendations of the Racial Distinctions Committee. Even if the Secretary of State in Council has interfered only in some of these matters, it is a cause for public alarm in India, and it is necessary to consider how we could help the Government of India resist these

encroachments. At the time this principle was enunciated, I remember pointing out that, if it was to be at all efficacious, the Government of India ought to be expressly freed from the necessity of previously consulting the Secretary of State before taking part in the discussions with the Legislature. My information is that the rules require such previous reference in far too many matters yet. This unwholesome practice unduly limits the initiative of the Government of India and automatically narrows the limits of possible concurrence with the Legislature. It is no wonder if the tendency to reaction, wherever it exists in the official world, has received encouragement by knowledge of these circumstances, betokening, as they do, a change in the atmosphere of Whitehall. The Secretary of State has sent out orders forbidding Local Governments to refer to Committees any question in any manner affecting any of the Imperial Services. In practice this would greatly narrow the scope of our Legislatures and prevent them from even advising on reserved subjects, let alone exercising increased influence over them.

Since I spoke on this subject in Bombay my opinion about diarchy has not been shaken. I think it has reached its limit of usefulness. Not having inside knowledge of any administration, I am unable to enforce my opinion by a striking array of specific instances. Perhaps Ministers at present in office and Executive Councillors, when freed from official restraints and called upon to state their experience before

a duly authorised commission, will make out an overwhelming case for the termination of duality in provincial administration. The best results have been obtained where Governors have treated Councillors and Ministers as belonging to one Cabinet. The rule requiring that the Finance Member should be an Executive Councillor has placed Ministers at a decided disadvantage in obtaining money for their departments. Official discipline too is difficult to maintain, as Ministers have discovered, when an officer cannot be censured or transferred except with the consent of the Governor. In some provinces Ministers are not recognised as forming one official group. This practice violates the recommendation of the Joint Select Committee, which was in these words:—"In these circumstances the Committee think that it should be recognized from the commencement that Ministers may be expected to act in concert together. They probably would do so; and in the opinion of the Committee it is better that they should, and therefore that the fact should be recognised on the face of the Bill." Some Ministers have complained that, while anybody and everybody was free to communicate his views on the O'Donnell circular to the Government of India, they, *i. e.*, the Ministers, were precluded from doing so, because their Governor took a narrow view of diarchy and would not consult them where a reserved subject was concerned. In another case a Minister had to threaten to resign before the Governor would allow him to choose his under-Secretary. A Governor has

even been known to play a backward section of the Legislative Council against his Ministers, who could not except in special cases depend on the official votes either. They thus depend on a highly precarious and shifting majority. The United Provinces Council presented to a scandalized India the spectacle one day of an Executive Councillor speaking against a Minister and on another day the spectacle of a Minister requesting his own Secretary not to move an amendment to which he, the Minister, had not given his consent. In the same province for many days a Councillor and a Secretary were openly accused, without eliciting any satisfactory reply, of canvassing members of the Legislature against the District Boards Bill which had been brought forward by a Minister. The fact that no notice is known to have been taken of these incidents by the Governor would seem to lend colour to the suspicion that he rather enjoyed the confusion of the Minister in the circumstances. In Madras, where the evils of diarchy are the least felt, the desire for complete provincial autonomy is the strongest. One of the Ministers of that province said the other day :

“ I am Minister of Development *minus* Forests and you all know that Development depends a good deal on Forests. I am Minister of Industries without Factories, which are a reserved subject and Industries without Factories are unimaginable. I am Minister of Agriculture *minus* Irrigation. You can understand what that means. How Agriculture can be carried on

extensively without Irrigation in the hands of those who are responsible for it is rather hard to realise. I am also Minister of Industries without Electricity, which is also a reserved subject. You all know the part which Electricity is playing in the development of Industries now-a-days. The subjects of Labour and of Boilers are also reserved. But these after all are some of the defects of the Reform Scheme."

A half and half system is naturally productive of friction and wears out the nerves of those who have to work it. Members of the services are not the least loud in demanding that the system should be developed to the full. It seems now to serve no useful purpose. No one, official or non-official, has questioned the efficiency of Ministers or their ability to manage the reserved services if these should be entrusted to their care. The public will long remember the indiscriminate arrests of a few months ago and the high handed use in certain places of section 144 of the Code of Criminal Procedure and they no longer wish to have such powers exercised by officers without fear of being called to account in the House of Legislature.

These remarks should not be interpreted as amounting to a wholesale condemnation either of diarchy or of the machinery of which it forms a feature. An enumeration of the good work accomplished by the popular side of our Local Governments would be cheerful reading. Here is a summary, by no means careful or exhaustive.

Ministers in all the Provinces have to their credit legislative measures which will redound to the country's advantage. I need instance only a few in order to show how successful they are in initiating new policies in their respective departments. It is an unfortunate circumstance that Ministers were called to administer these departments just when financial difficulties became very serious; and therefore naturally the first reforms to be effected were those which did not entail much outlay of money. For instance, municipalities and district boards have in most provinces been placed on a popular footing. But Ministers have not shrunk from undertaking large schemes of expansion involving heavy increases in expenditure and thus facing additional taxation. Some of the measures introduce bold new departures in policy which would have been almost inconceivable in the old régime. I would give the first place among these to Dr. Paranjpye's Compulsory Education Act, which replaces the optional compulsion of the Act of 1918 by absolute compulsion and seeks to universalise primary education in the whole of the Presidency within ten years. When the whole scheme is completed, it will throw an additional burden upon the provincial exchequer of more than three quarters of a crore every year. Mr. Chintamani has introduced in the United Provinces excise reforms calculated to effect a very drastic reduction in the consumption of alcohol, etc. In the Bombay Presidency Mr. C. V. Mehta has not yet been able to complete

his inquiry into this question, but he has already introduced a reform which, if small in itself, initiates a new policy substituting direct for indirect checks on consumption. In Madras Ministers have adopted the policy of giving judicious State aid to new or nascent industries and have put in hand several other measures of no small benefit to the Province. Reform of old Universities and the establishment of new ones are taken in hand in several provinces. These and other measures of the kind are the first fruits of the popular control over transferred departments for which we the Constitutionals need not blush.

It is not meant that diarchy has been a pitfall to the feet or a fetter to the limbs of Ministers. But it has serious defects, as has been pointed out. It has served its purpose as a test and as a preparation. It is now a clog and an irritation. The demand for its removal comes from many sides. The satisfaction of the demand will go far to allay public discontent and ease the tension between the Government and the people. The Legislative Assembly has lent its countenance to the acceleration of the pace of the march of India's constitution. No risks need be apprehended from the grant of full autonomy to the provinces, except the loss of two Councillorships in the bigger, and one Councillorship in the smaller, provinces to the Indian Civil Service.

If at our next election the matter is properly placed before the constituencies there can be no doubt of their giving a mandate to their representatives to

try and secure provincial autonomy as early as possible. A legal difficulty occurs to me. Supposing the question of provincial autonomy were raised by a private member in a legislature in 1924, and a resolution were moved asking that representatives be elected to an all-India Convention for the purpose, would the Governor be justified in disallowing the resolution? I am informed that the law would permit him to do so. At the same time the law would not stand in the way of his allowing the resolution either. So that it would be largely a question of how thoroughly the constituencies had been educated in the matter and what momentum the demand for provincial autonomy had gathered. If our Non-Co-operating friends would not indulge in the violent fun of breaking up of other people's meetings, but cheerfully help in the good work, the prospect would by no means be gloomy. Should any Governor, however, be obdurate, the elected members of the Legislature could still obey their mandate by meeting at their own instance without fear of their proceedings losing moral authority in the eyes of reasonable people.

Speaking a few months ago to a meeting of Bombay Liberals, I expressed my opinion of the provision regarding the appointment of a statutory commission after ten years. The obvious interpretation is that while Parliament must appoint a commission at that time, there is nothing to prevent a commission issuing before that period. During the Commons debate in 1919 Mr. Montagu explained the

point clearly in these words: "If there is a remarkable and unforeseeable development in Indian conditions in the short space of ten years, it does not tie the hands of Parliament in any way whatever. There can always be a commission appointed in the interim." On another motion Mr. H. A. L. Fisher delivered himself of a similar opinion: "May I point out that there is nothing in the Bill which prevents revision taking place before ten years, but there must be a revision at the expiration of ten years? If it be true that great progress will be made, and if it becomes obvious that the transferred subjects are being handled wisely and effectively to the satisfaction of the Indian population by the Indian Ministers, then there is no obstacle to a revision at an earlier period than ten years." Let it be remembered that in the original proposals of Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford it had been suggested that a fresh transfer of subjects should take place at the end of five years. It would be pedantic, it would be inexpedient, nay it would be a political blunder against which it is our duty to warn Government, to prolong the trying period of transition unnecessarily, to allow the sense of grievance to deepen until it becomes a danger and to refuse to rectify an error which actual experience has exposed in the divided constitution of the provinces. I therefore commend a suggestion which our honoured leader Sir Sivaswamy Aiyar has made at the end of his article in *The Nineteenth Century and After* in these words: "The least that should be done by the Gov-

ernment in the present circumstances is to send out a small but strong committee of statesmen and constitutional lawyers to ascertain on the spot how the system of diarchy has been working, what defects have been brought to light, and what remedies could be devised to promote smoothness and efficiency in working " Before, however, the present Conservative Government would take this step, they would have to be convinced that the constituencies in India desired it strongly and had expressed their desire in the usual way at election time.

This, however, is not the whole of our demand. At the last session this Federation of Liberals asked in addition that the Central Government should be brought under popular control in all matters except ecclesiastical, political and defence. Perhaps that resolution would be repeated at this session. When I presided earlier in the year at the meeting of Bombay Liberals, I ventured to express a feeling of hesitation with reference to this demand and indicated my grounds for the hesitation. But I promised at the same time that in a matter of that kind, where the difference was not one of aim or principle but of temporary expediency, I should consider myself bound by the superior wisdom of the party. Sir Sivaswamy Aiyar, a safe man, if there is one in our ranks, has pleaded cogently for popularisation of the Central Government in the article from which I have already quoted. An argument that appeals to me is contained in the following sentences. " The Central

Legislature has enormous voting power, but absolutely no responsibility. But for the fact that the Government has displayed the greatest possible tact and the members of the Legislature great self-restraint, and that both sides have been anxious to make the Reforms a success, there would have been a deadlock several times during the course of the last year and a half. It is impossible for the Government to adopt any cold policy in any matter, legislative, administrative or financial, for the reason that they cannot be certain beforehand of the amount of support that they are likely to receive in the Assembly. The divorce of power and responsibility, which was regarded as the greatest defect of the Minto-Morley scheme, is perpetuated in a magnified form in the Central Legislature at the present moment." I have likewise endeavoured to ascertain the views of as many men of our party as possible and I find that although some share my hesitation, opinion preponderates heavily on the other side. Let me therefore fall in publicly with the majority view. After all, when the provinces have attained autonomy and assumed responsibility for peace and order, the Central Government cannot long lag behind. Its responsibility to the constituencies must arrive inevitably, and the sooner the better.

While agitation for these important advances is in progress, each day will bring its own problems. I see Members of the Assembly are bringing up a motion for the abolition of the distinction between

votable and non-votable items of expenditure.' The non-votable items far exceed the limits which are compatible even with a first instalment of the power of the purse. What is almost a humiliation to the Government and Legislature alike is that the salaries and pensions of persons appointed by the Secretary of State in Council and of Chief Commissioners and judicial Commissioners should be excluded from the scope of the Assembly's vote or discussion. The correct principle is for the Imperial Government to guarantee the salaries and pensions only of those officers who are appointed by the Crown. It is little short of a slight to treat as sacrosanct enormous sums taken from the taxpayer and payable to junior officers reaching down in some cases to below Rs. 500 a month. We know that, when responsible government was given to other communities, due provision was made for British services. But then this demand is not that the Government of India should be made absolutely responsible, and the Governor-General in Council has overriding powers for exceptional cases. Serious objection would likewise be taken to allowing military expenditure to be voted by the Assembly. We admit that expenditure depends on policy and military policy it would be premature for the Assembly to attempt to lay down or regulate. But the difficulty is all the creation of the executive. If they had used their irresponsible power with moderation and kept the military Budget within the limits of reason, the revolt against budget exclusions

would not be so strong. But as it is, a desperate situation can only be met by a desperate remedy, and as the Assembly consists of human beings and not of angels, the Government might find that they had presumed too far on what was once euphemistically described as the Indian's faculty of unlimited acquiescence.

FORMATION OF PARTIES

There is also much in the working of our constitution which cannot give cause for satisfaction. In no case has responsibility been brought home to a Minister. When a Minister was recently defeated in a certain province over an important Bill on a transferred subject, he neither resigned nor was called upon to resign. The country would perhaps have welcomed a proof that the Legislature not only has the power of dismissal in law but can actually exercise it on adequate occasion. It is with profound grief that one records the impression that in the Punjab and Madras the majority has shown that it cannot be trusted to treat the minority with fairness and equity. The evil in the southern province is bound to be felt for a long time yet. May I from this place appeal to my friends, Dewan Bahadur Kesava Pillay and C. Ramalinga Reddy, to use their undoubted influence so that the bitterness may be assuaged and the younger generation grow up in an atmosphere of less strife and contention? One may venture to think that there is no need any more for non-Brahmin leaders to spread the unloving gospel, "Do not vote for the Brahmin,

never trust the Brahmin." No clear definition of parties has yet been evolved, except in the Assembly and there for a wonder the Democratic party glories in having no leader. No Leader, no discipline—is an axiom in political organization. In the country at large people are mostly under the spell of that pious doctrine of inexperience, unity. A vague hankering after a reconciliation of all parties and the honours of a universal peacemaker is the dominant characteristic of a considerable number of men in public life, of attractive personality and decided talent, but unwilling to recognize that Indian politics have come into a phase of reality in which unity is not only impossible, but a sure sign of inefficacy. The apparent advantage of being free to embrace what is for the time being convenient stands in the way of most people labelling themselves Moderates or Extremists, Liberals or Non-Co-operators. As soon as the votes are polled and the names of the successful candidates announced, it ought to be possible, as in other countries, to calculate the exact distribution of parties in the legislatures. Not knowing how many their followers are, Ministers, supposed to represent the non-official part of the legislature are compelled to look upon the official nominated element as the nucleus of their voting strength, hoping by individual negotiation to beat up a few more recruits on each occasion—a most distressing situation for those who are expected to build up the strength of the popular party. How dare we talk of full Parliamentary

institutions so long as nine out of every ten politicians will refuse to take a name, be classified or acknowledge a leader? As to the education of electorates to which our venerated leader, Sir Dinshaw Wacha, drew our attention last May, nothing much seems to be done. Even if special popular lectures on civics should prove impracticable, and there is no reason why they should do so, the practice might at least be started of members going down to their constituencies after the rising of Parliament and speaking to them on what has been done or may be done. Our new constituencies cannot be expected to compel the attendance of their representatives for some time yet; the representatives should regard it as their duty to keep them fully informed as to the state of public affairs and legislation. The lesson will soon have to be learnt that nothing of more than ordinary consequence could be done in Parliament without the wish of the electorates on the subject having been specifically ascertained. Besides being illiterate, ignorant and desirous to be let alone, the ordinary elector is liable to be gull'd by the demagogue and persuaded to vote for the person who makes the most intemperate speeches and the most extravagant promises. The education of the electorates even in advanced countries is a never-ending process. When I was last in London during the season of the recent General Election, I heard no remark so often as this—that a large number of men and women had come into the registers for the first time, that they

had no experience, and no calculation could be made as to how they would vote. Candidates, whether successful or not, and when successful more than otherwise, must remember that this is more their duty than that of others. The situation is devoid of hope so long as the bulk of our legislators grudge the few weeks at a time they give to public business and, as soon as Parliament rises, do not think of going to their electorates and rendering an account of their doings, but run back to their business, briefs or lands.

ORGANISATION OF OUR PARTY.

I will now ask your leave to say one or two words about our party. It would perhaps be best to clear the ground of two criticisms. We have from the very nature of the case to answer charges from two opposite ends. Our extremist countrymen complain that we have merged ourselves in the bureaucracy and must be held responsible for their blunders, high handedness and repression. Our answer must be firm and frank. So long as they will proclaim war on the established government, talk openly of revolution, inculcate disloyalty and rash political action and send about the country a committee of men of influence with the express object of finding out the prospects of a campaign of civil disobedience, we must sternly disapprove and stoutly oppose. So long as they preach the gospel of despair, they command neither our assent nor even our sympathy. So long as they boycott the present constitution, pooh-pooh the reforms and talk of

wrecking the Councils, there is no common ground between us and we can have nothing to do with them. Officials and organs of official opinion deplore our lack of organisation and vigorous propaganda. We must admit the truth of this charge, though we are not without excuse. But when they attack us for indecision of thought, fear of unpopularity and a tendency to take up the most violent and passionate cries of the extremists and echo them feebly, thus affording no constant support to Government, we must repudiate the charges as unfounded. Our business is to promote our country's welfare, to enlarge her political status through the present constitution, to secure her ordered progress and compatibly with these aims, but not otherwise, to support Government. When government officials go beyond the necessities of the case and become indiscriminate in repressive measures, threatening to stifle the very spirit of agitation, we will not hesitate to condemn their action. When the Secretary of State abuses his irresponsible power in disregard of the Indian tax-payer, we cannot but protest. When we are faced with a prospect of stagnation while there is so much to do every day in the direction of preparing the Indian people for Self-government, we must give solemn warning. We are prepared to let our leaders accept office and support them when they carry out our policy and our aim. We will oppose and thwart them when they neglect or defy our wishes. It is amazing how they expect us to stand

by them when they do us harm as well as when they do us good, in their excessive military expenditure, in their high-handedness, in their hesitation to afford Indian talent every possible opening for employment in the highest and most delicate spheres of work, seeing that in no long time Indians must be prepared for Self-government. Our English brethren must understand this clearly. Every day we shall ask, what has been done to-day towards the advent of Swaraj? Of every officer we shall inquire, does he realize that he is here to fit our people for self-rule? Of every rupee of expenditure we shall require to be satisfied that it was unavoidable and in the interests of India. We believe in the ideals of the Britannic Commonwealth, we cherish our connection with it, trusting that our equal partnership therein, which has been admitted in theory, will soon be translated into fact in all essentials. We believe in the efficacy of peaceful and constitutional methods, and in the pursuit of our high aims we are upheld by the consciousness that they have been admitted as proper and legitimate by the highest authority. And as our motto is *Ordered Progress*, we do not despise compromise in public affairs, provided it is honourable, advances the present position and does not bar further progress.

The first requisite of a party organisation is the maintenance of a list of members who are prepared to own themselves as belonging to the Liberal Federation, to subscribe to its principles and to pay a

certain prescribed fee periodically. The second requisite is to appoint a leader for all India and for each province every year, who will be entitled during his period of office to speak for the party, to treat with Government on behalf of his party, to call meetings of the Executive when necessary for the purpose of determining policy or action, to bring up matters of discipline when they are of more than ordinary importance, and to be consulted before individuals in the party or groups make serious pronouncements or adopt definite action on important occasions. It would be well to adopt the term leader, for it would carry the right to lead and therefore signify real business. President, on the other hand, suggests mere dignity and may go to the man of wealth or social standing and is no good for our present purpose. He should be placed with funds so as to command secretarial facilities. The third requisite would be a general fund, both for propaganda and electioneering purposes. This, however, would be very slow in growing and we need not be discouraged by it.

Report on the Dominions Tour.

The following is the full text of the Report by the Rt. Hon. Mr. Sastri regarding his Deputation to the Dominions of Australia, New Zealand and Canada. It was submitted to the Government early in January 1923 :—

I HAVE the honour to submit a report of my visit to the Dominions of Australia, New Zealand and Canada.

2. Accompanied by my Secretary—Mr. G. S. Bajpai, I.C.S.—I sailed by the S. S. 'Ormonde' from Colombo on May 22nd and arrived at Fremantle, the port of Western Australia on June 1st where I was received by the Acting Premier of the State, Mr. Colebatch and an official of the Prime Minister's Department, Mr. W. A. Smith, who was attached to me throughout the period of my stay in the Commonwealth. I sailed from Sydney for New Zealand on July 6th and in the interval visited the capital of every State in the Commonwealth with the exception of Tasmania, to which, on account of the prevalent climatic conditions and the comparative insignificance of the resident Indian population, it was not considered desirable that I should proceed. Everywhere I was the recipient of the most generous hospitality from officials and non-officials, and noth-

ing could exceed the warmth or sincerity of the welcome which was extended to me as a representative of the Government of India. The arrangements made for my comfort by the Government of the Commonwealth were in every way satisfactory, and I should like to place on record my gratitude to Mr. W. A. Smith of the Prime Minister's Department whose aid was invaluable in the furtherance of my mission.

3. The primary object of my mission to Australia as well as to the other Dominions was to induce the respective Governments to give practical effect to the resolution of the Imperial Conference of 1921 which recognised "that there is an incongruity between the position of India as an equal member of the British Empire and the existence of disabilities upon British Indians lawfully domiciled in some parts of the Empire," and recommended that "in the interests of the solidarity of the British Commonwealth it was desirable that the rights of such Indians to citizenship should be recognised." I was further generally instructed to look into any other disabilities of Indians resident in Australia and to request the authorities concerned to remove them. Another duty was to enquire into the possibility of securing admission for Indian students into the various Australian Universities and to ascertain whether these bodies would be ready to arrange an interchange of professors and lecturers with Indian Universities as a step towards the establishment

of a better understanding between India and Australia.

4. My method of enquiry in regard to the disabilities of domiciled Indians was to collect the fullest information from official sources as well as from representative Indians whom I met in the various capitals. A list of these disabilities which Indians share with other Asiatics is given below :—

(1) *Disabilities in regard to political status.*—

(a) *Franchise for and Membership of Parliaments.—Commonwealth.*—An aboriginal native of Australia, Asia, Africa, or the Islands of the Pacific (except New Zealand) cannot be an elector for the Senate or the House of Representatives, unless he is entitled under the law of the State to vote at elections for the more numerous House of the Parliament of the State (Commonwealth Franchise Act, 1902, section 3, and Constitution Act, 1901, section 41.)

(b) *Queensland.*—Indians as aboriginal natives of Asia are disqualified from membership of the Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly (Constitution Act, 1867) and from voting at elections for the Assembly (Elections Act, 1915, section 9). The Council which was the upper house has now been abolished in Queensland.

(c) *Western Australia*.—Aboriginal natives of Australia, Asia or Africa may be registered as electors for the Council in respect of a freehold qualification but not for the Assembly (Constitution Acts: Amendment Act, 1899, sections 7, 15, 20: Electoral Act, 1907, sections 17, 18)

(2) *Disabilities in regard to property*.—All Asiatics are disqualified from obtaining leases of land in certain irrigation and reclaimed areas. (Irrigation and Reclaimed Lands Act, 1914, section 19.)

(3) *Disabilities in regard to employment and occupation*.—

(a) *Commonwealth*.—Bounties under the various Bounties Act, 1907-1912 are payable only in respect of goods grown or produced by white labour.

(b) *Queensland*.—

(1) The Dairy Produce Act, 1920.

(2) The Beche-de-Mer Fishery Act, 1913.

(3) The Sugar Works Act, 1911.

(4) The Sugar Cultivation Act, 1913, and

(5) The Banana Industries Preservation Act, 1921,

prohibit the employment in the various industries of persons who have not in the first instance obtained in the manner prescribed by the Acts a certificate that they are able to read and write from dictation not less than 50 words in the English language. In practice

these Acts have the effect of excluding all Asiatics from these trades or occupations.

(c) *Western Australia*.—Miners' rights may not be issued to, nor may an interest therein be held by Asiatics or Africans, even though British subjects, without the Minister's approval. (Mining Act, 1904.)

(4) *Miscellaneous,—Commonwealth*.—Indians are disqualified from receiving invalid and old-age pensions. Enquiry made from Indians further showed that some difficulty was encountered in the administration of passport regulations especially in regard to the admission of substitutes for resident Indians wishing to return temporarily to India

5. Each one of these grievances I discussed with the authorities concerned, and the results of my negotiations in regard to them will be stated in separate paragraphs. Before proceeding to do this, however, it may be desirable to make a few general remarks on the distribution of the Indian population in the various States of the Commonwealth, their occupation and outlook and their social and economic conditions.

6. The total Indian population in the Commonwealth of Australia is approximately two thousand. Accurate figures as to the province-wise distribution of this population are not available, as the census authorities include in the enumeration Indians who happen to be in port on the day when the census is

taken. From official and private enquiry, however, I was able to obtain the following approximate figures :—

Western Australia.	South Australia.	Victoria	New South Wales	Queens- land.	Tasmania.
300	200	400	700	300	100

Mohammadans predominate in all these States. Only a few Sikhs are to be found in New South Wales and Queensland. Statistics of occupation were not available; but I gathered that the majority were engaged in retail trade or in agricultural operations. Instances of success in these occupations are numerous, the most notable being those of one Mr. Bad Ullah from Sind who has settled in Western Australia and owns a large sheep station of 250,000 acres of land and 25,000 head of sheep, and a firm of Indian mercers, Messrs. Wassiamall Assamall who have flourishing branches at Melbourne and Sydney. Nearly all look prosperous and, even where economic prejudice operates to their detriment, the remuneration for manual labour for each man is seldom less than 12 shillings a day. Of social prejudice I saw little trace. A good many Indians have married Australian wives from whom they have children and live in harmony and friendship with their neighbours. I visited a few families and was assured by the wives that they suffered from no social disabilities.

7. The question of prejudice brings one to the so-called white Australian policy which is often interpreted to signify not merely the determination of Australians to exclude Asiatics, but as an instrument of persecution for those Orientals who have taken up their residence in Australia. I have already alluded to the social relation in which the Indian community in Australia stand to their white neighbours. So far as the restrictive side of the policy in regard to emigration from abroad is concerned, it commands the support of an overwhelming majority, who look upon it as sacrosanct. Various causes have led to the crystallisation of the policy and the attitude of mind on which it is based. The sensitiveness and vigilance of both the Australian public and the Australian Press in this matter may be gathered from the fact that, in spite of repeated declarations that the Government of India stood by the reciprocity resolution of 1918 which concedes to each community of the Britannic Commonwealth the right to regulate the composition of its own population, my mission was to the end criticised in certain circles as an insidious attempt to seek a revision of the policy by securing concessions, which would make immigration to Australia attractive to Indians in the future. Though the criticism was confined to the circles in sympathy with labour views, it necessitated emphatic assurances on my part of the determination of the Government of India to abide by the reciprocity resolution of 1918. The result was evident in the consideration which I received at the

hands of the various Governments and in the creation of an atmosphere generally favourable to the realisation of those objects for which the Government of India had deputed me to visit the Dominions. Had I shown the slightest disposition to throw doubt on the validity of the 1918 compact, the mission would have been foredoomed to failure.

8. In regard to the Commonwealth franchise I was informed by the legal advisers of the Commonwealth Government that the Commonwealth Election Act of 1902 creates a separate Commonwealth franchise, which cannot automatically follow from the conferring of the provincial franchise on any class of citizens on a date subsequent to the passing of the Act. This is the interpretation to which successive Attorneys-General have adhered and, although it is not supported by judicial authority, it may be taken for all practical purposes as necessitating a special Act of the Federal Parliament to enfranchise those Indians who were not in enjoyment of the State franchise before the Act of 1902 became law. This was the view which I urged on the Commonwealth Government, and their attitude can best be indicated in the following words of the Prime Minister of Australia, Mr. Hughes.

9. "In regard to the franchise although I am not able to speak on this subject with such assurance and with such finality as on the old age pensions question (see paragraph 12 of Report) I do not hesitate to repeat in the plainest possible terms that you

have brought within the range of practical politics a reform which but for your visit would have been most improbable, if not impossible, of achievement." A more definite promise was not possible in view of the political situation in Australia and the distribution of parties in the Parliament. Both at the Parliamentary dinner given by the Government of the Commonwealth at which I pleaded for an early grant of the Dominion franchise to domiciled Indians, and at private interviews with Mr. Charlton, the leader of the labour party and Dr. Page, the leader of the country party, I received assurances of sympathy and support, and I hope that this fundamental reform will be effected at no distant date. The desire to satisfy Indian aspirations in this respect is widespread and genuine. Its fruition may temporarily be retarded by political exigencies which are incidental to Parliamentary Government and cannot be prevented. Of course the electors of Australia would have to be reminded of the great importance attached in India to the franchise of the Dominions as a proof of her equal status and equal partnership in the Empire, and of the imperial significance which the problem acquires from that fact.

10. In Western Australia and Queensland where Indians do not enjoy the political suffrage in respect of elections to the Lower House, there is every reason to hope that the Governments concerned will follow the lead of the Dominion Cabinet. Without such lead the State authorities are reluctant to take the

initiative, for reasons arising from the existence of sharply defined political parties.

11. The Government of South Australia promised to amend the Irrigation Act so as to render Indians eligible for leases of land under the Act. The disability in Western Australia as regards the acquisition of mining rights is not statutory but is remediable by the Minister in charge of mines, and I was assured by the Premier of the State that any future applications of Indians for such rights would be sympathetically considered.

12. During my stay in Brisbane the Government of Queensland resolved to remove the restrictions to which Indians engaged in the banana industry were subjected under the Act of 1921; the only other laws which affect them are the Sugar Cultivation Act of 1913 and to a smaller extent, the Dairy Produce Act. The Beche-de-Mer and other Statutes mentioned in paragraph 3 of this report have no practical bearing upon the Indian situation as there is hardly an Indian engaged in these industries. The amendment of the relevant Acts may be expected to follow the passing of legislation in the Commonwealth Parliament rendering Indians eligible for invalid and old age pensions. Labour is always suspicious of measures of relief to oriental rivals, and the Labour Government of Queensland is naturally anxious to dispel apprehensions by giving to its remedial legislation the impress of a general policy adopted in deference to larger imperial interests. The Commonwealth Government

promised to introduce legislation to amend the present Invalid and Old-age Pensions Act at an early date. This would confer a real benefit on the older Indians settled in the country who are devoid of personal resources and disabled from pursuing their normal vocations. The Bounties Acts were only in operation during the war and are no longer applicable. There is no need to seek for the amendment of what is already a dead letter.

13. Difficulties in regard to the entry of Indians into Australia arise in connection with—

- (i) incomplete passports; and
- (ii) the admission of substitutes,

It often happens that a person, wishing to go to Australia either to assist a relative or friend already there or in hope of getting an occupation with his help, obtains a passport describing him as a visitor, and being unable to satisfy the immigration authorities, finds himself in trouble. The Minister of the Interior, who administers the immigration regulations and with whom I discussed the question, informed me that, although the general practice about admitting substitutes was to confine the privilege to persons who came out to act for men engaged in promoting overseas wholesale trade between Australia and the Eastern countries, Indian substitutes were allowed to land if they came as substitutes for farmers, retail storekeepers or in some cases even for hawkers. All that a substitute has to do is to obtain a bond in the sum of £100 and to accept the condition that he will

leave Australia within three months of the return of the permanent resident to the Commonwealth. A similar condition is imposed on the resident to leave within three months of the arrival of the substitute. The attitude of the authorities seemed to me to be reasonable and the only action necessary would appear to be a closer scrutiny of passports issued by the Local Governments in India to persons proceeding to Australia to make sure that only *bona fide* substitutes get permits. Full information about the object of an applicant's visit and the probable duration of stay should be shown on the passport in order to eliminate such difficulties as individuals falling under the category of merchants, students and tourists might conceivably experience on landing in Australia.

14. In the Universities of Adelaide, Melbourne and Sydney, which are the best equipped and the most widely known, my request for the admission of Indian students was very favourably received. The accommodation in these Universities is limited owing to the pressure of indigenous students, but I have no doubt that the authorities would welcome the entry of suitable students from India in moderate numbers. A similar assurance was given me by the University of Perth. In Brisbane I saw for myself that the local demand leaves no room for outside students. The first three Universities would also be prepared to consider any reasonable proposal for the exchange of lecturers that might emanate from the Indian Universities.

15. The foregoing paragraphs briefly summarise the results of my visit to Australia. The promise of legislation to render Indians eligible for old age pensions, the removal of disabilities in regard to employment in the banana industry in Queensland and the undertaking of the Government of South Australia to eliminate the only restriction on their statute book applicable to Indians, *viz.*, exclusion from leases of Crown lands in the Murray region does not amount to a complete settlement of our differences with the Australian authorities, but it is a satisfactory index of the spirit in which the latter are prepared to give effect to the resolution of the Imperial Conference of 1921. Even more gratifying was the cordial sympathy manifested by all sections of the people to the requests which I made on behalf of the Government of India. The principle of equality of citizenship is now recognised as vital to the continuance of friendly relations between the various parts of the Empire, and there is a general disposition to concede equality in view of the assurances that nothing will be done to disturb policy of restricted emigration which the majority of Australians look upon as necessary to their economic safety and well-being. It is easy to underrate the effect of popular sympathy; but in democratic countries it is the only foundation on which a reform which has long been hindered by ignorance and prejudice can be based. The appeal to imperial solidarity, justice and fairplay on which I based my case evoked wide-spread response. Ere long it

should help to consummate the aspiration which the Government and the people of India have so much at heart.

NEW ZEALAND

I sailed from Sydney on the 6th of July and arrived in Wellington on the 11th. The Minister for the Interior, the Hon'ble David Stewart, and Mr. Hislop, Under-Secretary of State for Internal Affairs, received me on behalf of Government. As I was to leave for Vancouver on July the 25th it was decided to confine my visit to the North Island. During my stay I stayed for a week in Wellington, a couple of days in Rotarua, and the rest of the time in Auckland. The Government of New Zealand had made every arrangement for our comfort and both as cicerone and official guide—Mr. Hislop who accompanied me everywhere in the Dominion was invaluable. The reception accorded by the civic authorities was also most generous and enthusiastic; while nothing could exceed the courtesy shown me by Their Excellencies the Governor-General and Lady Jellicoe. Everywhere I saw manifestations of sympathy for India and her people and a genuine desire to establish a friendly understanding between the two parts of the Empire by the removal of outstanding differences.

2. The resident Indians in the Dominion of New Zealand number between 550 and 600. Exact figures were unfortunately not forthcoming as the

Census Department had not completed their report of the last census. The New Zealand Electoral Act gives franchise to all British subjects, and Indians, enjoy the privilege, just the same as other classes of His Majesty's subjects. Enquiry from Indians revealed the existence of two disabilities :—

- (1) exclusion from the benefits of the Old-age Pensions Act; and
- (2) difficulty of securing employment. I made representations on both subjects to the Government of New Zealand. As regards the former Mr. Massey's Cabinet informed me that there were no amendments proposed at present in the Act, but that when the time came to revise it, Government would consider my representations. In view of the fact that there are probably no Indians who fulfil the conditions regarding age required by the Act, and it is unlikely that any will be eligible for some years to come, no great hardship should result from the matter being allowed to stand over for the present. When the time comes, I have no doubt that the claims of Indians will receive a sympathetic consideration.

3. In this belief I am strengthened by the assurance given me by the Minister of Public Works that no Indians who could not find employment elsewhere would be provided with work by Government.

in order to enable them to earn a livelihood. In this connection it seems desirable to record an episode which reflects great credit on the Government of New Zealand. Some time ago a band of Indian labourers was employed on road construction, when white labourers refused to work with them. In this intransigent attitude they received the support of their union. The authorities declined to dismiss the Indians and their firm stand led to a collapse of the white strike. This instance is significant of the firmness and impartiality with which the Dominion of New Zealand administer their laws.

4. I was also at some pains to enquire into the causes which prevented Indians from securing employment. It will be idle to deny that in some cases colour prejudice is responsible for the result, but the prejudice is confined to a few, and so are the instances of unemployment among Indians. They do not enjoy the same degree of prosperity as their compatriots in Australia; but the explanation of this is to be sought not in any aggravated manifestations of prejudice as in a variety of causes wholly unconnected with racial animosity. The majority of Indians have not been long in the country and have yet to find their feet. Casual labour at a time when there is a general economic depression is a precarious source of livelihood. The revival of prosperity should improve their prospects. Such of them as have farms of their own are quite well to do.

5. In accordance with my instructions I made representations to the Government of New Zealand regarding the New Zealand Immigration Restrictions Amendment Act, 1920. Under the regulations framed under the Act it was provided:—

- (1) that temporary permits for visits for the purpose of pleasure, education or commerce should be issued only for a period of six months or less, extensions being given for extraordinary reasons only, and
- (2) the Government of New Zealand further suggested that the number of passports issued annually by the Government of India for temporary visits to New Zealand should be restricted in number, and that they should be issued only to people who had already arranged to leave New Zealand on the expiration of their temporary visits.

As a result of my negotiations the stipulation as to the number of permits or passports to be issued by the Government of India has been withdrawn, and it has also been agreed that such permits will in every necessary case be extended in order to enable a visitor to complete the purpose of his visit. The regulations further provide that Indians lawfully resident in New Zealand can leave the country only for four years without loss of domicile. The Government of New Zealand have agreed to amend this regulation if it is found that the time fixed can be safely extended with due regard to the prevention of fraudulent use of old certificates.

6. So far as grievances remediable by legislation or appeals to individual official or public opinion are concerned, this exhausts the list. I should, however, like to dwell on one feature of the situation which affects Indians both in Australia and New Zealand

and which to my mind calls for immediate improvement. It is the absence of a co-ordinating and protecting agency which could help the Indian community to realise its existence as a corporate entity, and assist individual members of the community in combating difficulties which arise from day to day. Neither in Australia nor in New Zealand do Indians possess sufficient education to take care of themselves. They are scattered over a very wide area; they are drawn from various classes, and they lack the equipment for organised effort. The Dominion authorities with the best will in the world cannot help them to overcome the shortcomings of defective education. If one of them wishes to secure a passage, there is difficulty with the shipping companies. If the authorities have to be approached regarding the admission of a substitute or a relation, there is difficulty owing to lack of mutual understanding. Most of these troubles are incidental to an imperfect knowledge of English and the strangeness of the environment in which they live. Its effect on the community as a whole is to paralyse unity of endeavour where the interests of all are concerned. The individual is similarly handicapped in the pursuit of his own vocation. Other countries provide the necessary aid to their nationals in the person of a Consular Officer. India maintains no such agency in the Dominions. Doubtless the Indian population both in Australia and New Zealand will, in future, probably be a dwindling factor, but this can of itself be no justification for a neglect of the

interests of those who are there. From several quarters I received suggestions or requests that this deficiency should be supplied. Nothing could be of more effectual help to the Indian community in these distant lands, than the presence of a sympathetic and duly accredited representative of their country who was charged primarily with the duty of protecting their interests; nothing could better smooth over difficulties which must arise between Governments so far removed from one another as the Governments of the Dominions and of India. If a Protector of Indians is appointed in Fiji, it might be possible to include the protection of Indian interests in New Zealand and Australia in his jurisdiction. If such an appointment be deferred, an alternative arrangement would seem to be to appoint an agent for the two Dominions; who might also combine with the duties of Protector and those of a Trade Commissioner if his work as Protector does not occupy all his time. But some action to help our nationals in these countries seems to me to be essential.

CANADA

I left Auckland on July the 25th and landed in Victoria, the capital of the province of British Columbia, on August the 11th. I was received on landing by Sir Joseph Pope, Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs, whom the Prime Minister of Canada had deputed to welcome me on behalf of his Government. Fortunately the Commissioner of

Emigration for the Pacific Coast was in the town, and I was able to ascertain from him the exact numbers and distribution of the Indian population in the Dominion. There are not more than 1,200 Indians in the whole of Canada to-day and of them nearly 1,100 are Sikhs and are mainly to be found in British Columbia. The remaining 100 are scattered over the rest of the country, the majority being found in the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. Compared with the pre-war figures which were in the neighbourhood of 6,000, there has been a very great decline in the Indian population, due partly to migration from Canada to the United States and partly to returns to India.

2. In British Columbia the majority of Indians resident are employed in the lumber trade as mill-owners, or operatives or carriers. Agriculture is the main occupation of the rest, although I found one or two in Toronto following literary pursuits such as journalism or accounting. Very few Indians work as labourers for others. The labour representatives whom I met in Vancouver and other private individuals informed me that the Indian is very industrious and steady and much in demand, and that consequently he commands sometimes even a higher wage than his European rival. In the circumstances it is only to be expected that the general level of prosperity of the Indian population in Canada should be high.

3. In Canada I had to apply myself to three tasks, *viz* :—

- (i) to secure the federal franchise for such Indians as do not already enjoy it ;
- (ii) to obtain the provincial and municipal franchise for Indians resident in British Columbia which is the only province that withholds these rights ; and
- (iii) to ascertain and ask for the removal of such other grievances as might exist unknown to the Government of India.

4. *Dominion franchise*,—Under section 30 (g) of the Dominion Elections Act persons, who by the laws of any province in Canada, are disqualified from voting for a member of the Legislative Assembly of such province in respect of race are not qualified to vote in such a province at elections to the Dominion House of Commons. That the disqualification is not absolute may be gathered from the provision included in the same sub-clause of the Act that the restriction shall not disqualify or render incompetent to vote any person who has served in the naval, military or air force of Canada in the late war. Other instances of the Dominion Parliament not strictly adhering to the provincial electoral qualifications for the purposes of dominion franchise are not uncommon. For instance, in the year 1900 the legislature of the province of Manitoba passed an Act providing that persons not of British birth and not resident for more than seven years in the province could not be enrolled as voters

unless they could read certain clauses in the Act in one of the following languages:—

English, French, German or any Scandinavian language.

This provision was intended to disfranchise Slave voters from the Ukraine, but the Dominion Parliament did not accept the disqualification and admitted them to the federal franchise. Precedents thus exist to enable the Dominion authorities to take separate action in order to confer the right of vote at Dominion elections on Indians resident in British Columbia, even though the Government of that province cannot see its way to confer the provincial suffrage on them. This argument as well as the recommendation of the Imperial Conference of 1921 which was assented to by the representatives of Canada I placed before the Federal Cabinet in Ottawa in order to expedite legislation in the desired direction. I quote the following from the Prime Minister's reply:—

"I desire to assure you that at the earliest favourable moment the Government will be pleased to invite the consideration of Parliament to your request that the natives of India resident in Canada be granted Dominion Parliamentary franchise on terms and conditions identical with those which govern the exercise of that right by the Canadian citizens generally."

From enquiry I ascertained that the present Electoral Act should come up for revision in the very near future and that the occasion will be suitable for recommending to Parliament the enfranchisement of Indians resident in British Columbia. The attitude

of politicians and the public generally would be favourable to such a measure, primarily on its merits as a measure of justice and also on account of its beneficial influence on the relations of India and Canada. There may be some disposition in political quarters in British Columbia to oppose it, but there is no reason to anticipate that their objections would not yield to a rational presentment of the case in its broader aspect. At every public meeting which I addressed, I urged on my audience the need for approaching the question in an imperial and not a provincial spirit. Their response seemed to be of happy augury for the future.

5. In British Columbia itself I found every readiness on the part of the Local Government to admit the reasonableness of my request, but a reluctance to make any definite pledge in view of the prevalent opinion in the province. The economic rivalry between the white and non-white races in British Columbia is more acute than in any other part of the Dominion. Indians do not share in the struggle to any appreciable extent as their numbers are comparatively insignificant, but the oriental element in the population of the Province composed of men from countries in the far East is considerable; and to those engaged in the task of earning their daily bread, racial distinctions are too intangible to provide a substantial basis for differentiation. The extent of popular prejudice may be gathered from the fact that last year a measure introduced in the Legislative Assembly

of the province to confer the vote on those Asiatics who had served with the Canadian forces during the late war was defeated. In such an atmosphere it is difficult to expect an immediate and auspicious initiative on the part of the provincial authorities. As Parliament was not sitting, I was unable to put my case before its members; but I spoke before several public audiences and also discussed the question of the franchise with representatives of labour organisations which are commonly supposed to be stronger in their opposition to claims of equality put forward on behalf of the Eastern races. The former were enthusiastic in their response to my appeal for equitable and equal treatment of Indians; the latter authorised me to state to Government that they would not oppose to any measure of relief that the latter might decide to introduce. All the signs point to a softening of prejudice and a broadening of vision; but persistent effort would appear to be necessary for some time yet in order to complete the task of political education without which no change can be expected in a democratic country. In British Columbia I am not hopeful of immediate results; but of the ultimate success of continued endeavours I have little doubt.

6. The other difficulties of resident Indians, besides exclusion from the municipal franchise in British Columbia in regard to which the attitude of the Provincial Government is similar to their attitude in respect of the political franchise, are of a minor

character. They arise out of applications for the admission of substitutes or children of relatives whom resident Indians wish to send to school in Canada, or from the rejection of applications for permission to return to India by Indians who entered Canada surreptitiously and are, therefore, not lawful residents. As regards the entry of substitutes there should be no difficulty in arriving at an arrangement similar to the one which exists in Australia. The admission of children not covered by the reciprocity resolution of 1918 presents some difficulty as the Department of Emigration do not feel sure that the privilege of introducing the children of relatives who merely wish to proceed to preparatory schools would not be abused. Once a child has been admitted, it is impossible for the Department to keep track of him or to compel his attendance at school; a loophole, it is feared, might thus be opened for the importation of child labour. A solution might be found in the consideration of each application on its merits, and I have urged this on the Minister for consideration. Indians who enter the country by evading the law have no legal claim to be allowed to register out with a view to retaining their domicile if they wish to return to India for a short visit; but as the Canadian authorities have not exercised their right to eject such people, I pointed out that their *de facto* citizenship might now be treated as a *de jure* qualification for the granting of permits. The Minister has promised sympathetic consideration. As regards the entry of

wives and children of resident Indians the Government of Canada are ready to administer the rules made under the reciprocity agreement of 1918 with the utmost sympathy and fidelity.

7. Reviewing the tour in the light of actual achievement and of prospective reform, I am glad that a deputation was sent to the Dominions. The constitutional importance to India of negotiating directly with the Dominions on matters of mutual interest through an accredited representative is too evident to need elaboration. What is less obvious is the educative value of such visits both for facilitating the realisation of the immediate objects in view and the promotion of a spirit of imperial solidarity. India has suffered in the past from lack of knowledge and of understanding. The progress made by her during the last 60 years is hardly known outside this country. The average citizen of a Dominion still regards India as a land of mixed poverty and splendour, barbaric in outlook and aspiration as well as in magnificence. He has had no opportunity of meeting Indians of refinement and culture, without which it is impossible to dissipate the phantom of superiority born of an imperfect appreciation of Indian capacity. The incentive to active trade relations between India and the Dominions has also been lacking to promote the personal intercourse which is the best solvent of prejudice. The only means of securing better relations in the future is the promotion of such intercourse. Of the desire of the Dominions to

understand India there can be no doubt. In the task of stimulating and satisfying this desire the educated people of India, no less than the Government, must do their full share.

Of the services of Mr. Bajpai as Secretary, I cannot write enough. To uncommon ability he adds uncommon industry and uncommon courtesy- It was a piece of good fortune to me that his services were available. I recommend them earnestly to the recognition of the Government of India.

The League of Nations

Under the auspices of the National University, Adyar, the Rt. Hon. Sastri delivered a lecture on "The League of Nations" on the 13th January, 1923, Dr. Besant presiding. He said :—

DR. Besant, Students of the National University and Friends.—The League of Nations owes its origin to the fervid humanitarianism of a great man who, however, unfortunately is much derided and ridiculed as a visionary. I am not here concerned to defend him at all from such attacks. But he had one great idea which, in spite of much opposition, he tried to embody in a complete institution for the benefit of our mankind. That he has not succeeded better is not his fault. The opposition came from many quarters and one is sorry to think that it came from the great nations as well as the small nations. But the idea of getting the peoples of the world to adjust their differences without recourse to war, except in the very last resort and as a matter of despair, is, I think, still very far from being realised. I am not one of those who are therefore disposed to think that the League of Nations is nothing. That is not the point of view I always take. I rather think that too many of us in India not less than elsewhere are in the habit of supposing that a thing has only got

to be just and true and necessary, and it will be there. It is the teaching partly through *a priori* reasoning to which we have been accustomed, which makes us think so. For instance, you have got on the wall opposite "There is nothing higher than Truth". But some people would always add there is nothing which conquers so much as the Truth. That may be so. But we have all got to realise that sometimes truth and justice take a long time to conquer. For ages upon ages, for millennia, it would seem as though their adversaries, untruth and injustice, were still triumphant. Great ideas take a great deal of time indeed to strike root amongst the nations of the world, and this particular idea that peoples who have differences must come to a common platform and by thorough discussion and compromise adjust their differences, actually speaking, this idea will take long to establish itself among us. To us here, it seems such an easy, simple thing. But it is not so really. At present the League of Nations is not altogether pacific. It is meant for the purpose of certainly putting an end to war. But so contradictory is human nature and so imperfect is it, that even the League of Nations has, in the final resort, to fall back on a threat of force, if it is to be able to carry its decrees to full fruition, and so a great many people are saying that after all what is this League of Nations except an instrument now and then threatening and coercing and if the League of Nations is dominated by the major nations of the world, it would only

mean tyrannising over the small ones, and it was further stated that the League of Nations could not operate at all except on a vote of unanimity. The critics said that that put the blinkers on the whole thing—this League of Nations will never work at all. We have been able to get over this thing at the Assembly of the League, at which it was my privilege to be present as a representative of this country. It was decided that unanimous resolutions could be taken on matters of supreme importance, while on matters of secondary importance the League could act even although it had not passed resolutions unanimously but adopted recommendations with a majority. This is all due to the fertility of Lord Balfour's intellect, and so now the League of Nations is placed beyond reproach of being unable to act except in cases, and there must be very few indeed, where unanimous vote could be obtained. But this other thing, the threat of force, is still there. We have not been able to remedy this defect. The League of Nations probably will always apply to have an Army and Navy of its own sufficiently to control and reconcile all powers that may defy its decrees. In my own judgment, it is just as well that it should be so to teach the peoples of the world that they are responsible for their actions, but the League of Nations has no right to do it. Let the League of Nations continue to rely as it does on its moral authority and never bring its physical force into active play. But short of war the League of Nations has applied its

best mind to the task of perfecting an instrument called the international blockade. It is a question involving the most awful difficulty in execution, difficulties of a diplomatic character, difficulties arising from naval and military strategy, difficulties also arising from the relative positions, geographical and otherwise, of countries in which we have been interested. But still as a striking proof of the ingenuity of the human mind the task apparently so difficult is brought within very near successful accomplishment by the continued labours of a Permanent Commission established for the purpose. That Commission incessantly is at work on this subject and when I was there a series of recommendations of great importance was brought forward which, however, for want of time, were referred to our successors, the Third Assembly. But the provisions of the blockade in so far as they have been published will convince any student of international affairs that if properly worked even at the present moment, it is capable of becoming a powerful weapon, when the League of Nations is threatened with an act of defiance on the part of any of its members. But it is not to the sanction behind the moral authority of the League of Nations that it is my purpose to refer to-day. I wish rather to ask you to dwell on the Constitution, for a minute, if you please, of the League. It is a somewhat curious Constitution. But in it may be seen reflected the difficulties attendant upon dealing with all affairs of an international character. You have to reconcile

prejudices and points of view as far apart as the continents of the world, as far apart as the civilisations of the world, as far apart as the might and majesty of the United States, for instance, on the one hand, and of a little state like Panama or Haiti, on the other. Now in order to be able to command the assent and whole hearted support of the great powers of the world like Japan or Great Britain, you have to introduce features in your Constitution which by their very inherent complexity would take away the confidence, such as there might be, of a small Power. If you want to infuse confidence in the smaller powers which are component members of the League the great nations may withdraw and then the League would crumble to pieces. It is a very hard task to reconcile the competing requirements and sometimes the contrary requirements of such a situation. They have a plan that has worked so far. The League is composed at the present moment of 48 or 49 states. Each state is to be represented at meetings of the full Assembly, which is the larger body, by three members and it is open to each member to have his own substitute or series of substitutes according to the resourcefulness of the nation which sends the deputy. The three people are ever the principal delegates and amongst them one has to be chosen to be the leader. Then he gives the vote at the time the vote is taken. For every nation there is only one vote. The Assembly consists therefore of 150 people entitled to sit as its component members. The Assembly

has its own sphere of operations. So many matters are mentioned specifically as coming within the jurisdiction of the Assembly. But the Assembly being big and meeting only once a year always on the first Friday of September, it has been considered necessary to constitute another body more select and compact to sit continually and attend to the work of the League from day to day. That body is called the Council, and to-day there are about 4 prominent members. Mind you, a member is not an individual. A member is a state. According to the position of the last Assembly at which India was represented as being one of the six non-permanent members, the four members are the four Great Powers, Great Britain, France, Japan and Italy. But the six non-permanent members are to be elected for a period of three years in the Assembly. The six non-permanent members are also to be chosen so as to satisfy the natural desires of the different parts of the world to be represented on the Council and also different civilisations and linguistic considerations coming to play as well. It is very difficult indeed to choose six nations of the world, and to satisfy all the nations. Canvassing of a rather vulgar kind takes place at the time of these elections. If a country spends some little money, sends clever smooth-tongued people to be represented, it gains the confidence, and the goodwill of the representatives of the other powers. It is likely that it will obtain a place on the non-payment part of the Council which would be of great value

to-day. Now the non-permanent member for Asia will be China. Last year, our good old friend, Sir William Meyer, who used to represent India in the two League Assemblies, told me that he was never sympathetic with the idea that Asia should be represented as a power by China. As a matter of fact, by right we should be there. Unfortunately, however, there are two considerations that weighed prominently against us. One is that we are part of the Empire of Great Britain, and that Empire is viewed with jealousy and suspicion by other powers and they do not like that the weight of Great Britain should be increased in the Council by a component of it, India, becoming also the holder of the seat there. That is one consideration which is likely to weigh against us for some time. The other consideration which by our own efforts we can surmount is the low regard in which we are held by the other members of the League of Nations. At the Assembly meeting it is rather difficult for the Indian members to put full weight unless they are backed by a powerful lever of public opinion in India and until also they are backed by the Government of India with all its resources. I will later on refer to this aspect of the matter. For the present moment I am concerned to point out that it is not right that in future, if it were possible, we should allow the continent of Asia to be represented by China, the objection to China being that although it is nominally a representative, it does not enjoy anything like a stable or well-ordered

government. Its people cannot speak with one coherent voice and it is by no means representative of the great civilisation of Asia. That, however, is a consideration which we should bear in mind for the future. At present the great powers that enjoy this non-permanent representation are Brazil, Spain, Belgium and Uruguay. Uruguay has come in because it is a South American State; all of them call themselves Republics, they are far from being Republics. All these States come from that part of the world and they generally hold the pistol at the head of the League. They come together like a band of brigands. They come there and act together. Now 18 people in a disorganised body make a good working nucleus and when they go about casting their votes it is no wonder that they always get their point. It came out very well when they elected judges to the International Court. India must be able to make its own direction in that way. But India is not backed by plentiful resources or by a powerful public opinion as well to handle in these matters to a certain extent.

Now the Council of the League is an independent body for a great many purposes. It can take decisions and carry out those decisions during the time when the Assembly does not meet. The Assembly must, however, be kept informed of work done by the Council. The relative position of the Assembly and the Council, however, carefully safeguarded by one or two regulations in the Constitution of the League, is still a matter of much dispute. Nobody

knows still the precise functions which the Council can discharge without the mandate from the Assembly. Nobody knows where the Assembly can interfere with the action of the Council or upset it in any matters. Luckily now when there are differences between the Council and the Assembly, there is provision made for the international tribunal to be worked by both bodies to adjust their differences. All several such disputes will have to arrive and be put before the International Court. In general, the Assembly is supposed to be the repository of final responsibility. The Assembly, as I said, is so constituted that it cannot act easily and cannot act continually. It depends so much on the Council. But it has been considered necessary to give the Council a very large sphere of independent action, while there are disputes arising, and when I sat at the Assembly an occasion arose over a discussion. You may remember, some of you, that I figured with unnecessary prominence over an opium dispute that came before the Assembly. My name has been dragged in as the representative of a more backward state of opinion in India, which made large sums of money in the sale of opium. I would refer to it later on. But once in the course of our representation, the representative of China, which is the culprit in opium matters but whose guilt had the good fortune of being awarded by reason that she was represented on the non permanent part of the Council by one who had acted then as the President of the Council, a young

man, Dr. Wellington Koo, and by reason of that fact China was able to change the censure of the world. But I do not think it will be possible to do so in future. When the time comes up I shall have a word to say on the subject of opium, how far we are responsible for it. But for the time being it happened that he (Dr. Wellington Koo) threatened me. He was the President of the Council who opened the Assembly. He was one of the prominent figures there and he threatened me as a matter of fact by starting a big question of the relative power of the Assembly and the Council, if he was not to have his way. Sir William Meyer and I put our heads together and said thus : If you are to start that kind of question nothing will suit us better. Come along, then ; settle the powers once for all." And like a prudent man, when he found the guage taken up easily, he went and consulted a lawyer and the lawyer told him that he had better hold his hands a bit, and so he went away from the field leaving us in possession. However, I expect that sooner or later the relative positions of these two great bodies in the League will be settled. It can never be settled until disputes are referred to the International Tribunal.

Having said so much of the Constitution, I must say about the method of the work, how the League functions. You have no idea about the enormous and complicated matters that come up for settlement in the Assembly meetings. For instance, disputes between great nations, questions of copyright, ship-

ping, questions of communications, very delicate questions about disease and the spread of infection all over the world, and also the fate of minorities, mandates, things of that kind of vast moment, have all got to be settled in the course of the five weeks, and each member receives from day to day a pile of printed and type-written matter and he has to read some of it, no man can master the whole. The work is done in a remarkable way and the method of work is reduced to an easy system. It is partly by reason of this fact that the publicity part of the League is almost perfect. In fact, it acts on the theory that nothing should be kept secret. If possible all things should be made available to the inquirers and that is why you get a number of copies and documents if you only say that you are a person generally interested in the things of the world. That is point No. I.

Point No. II is how the members of the Assembly divide up into a large number of Committees. We had these Committees in our time. Next year the same number will be kept up, but it may be modified. To each Committee every delegation from a country sends one delegate. It is so arranged that the delegation from each country can have full information about all nations that come there. Some one or other will be there on each Committee. The few men are carefully chosen. There is no reason why a country should not assert its full strength on a Committee if it pleases to do so. These Committees meet at an appointed time. Everything is now organised

and there is no confusion. It is better to send some man two or three times, so that if once he gets possession of the rights he would find it possible to do for his country the utmost that is possible. The full Assembly meets at one part of the morning and the Committees meet in the afternoon, after the Assembly ends, and then continually as often as Committees have their business. They send reports to the Assembly which we read and which form the subject of specific resolutions. It is really most wonderful how the Assembly and the Council keep working together during the five weeks and turn out matter which will repay perusal on every page of it, so interesting is the subject matter that is dealt with by these bodies.

Let me say a few things about India's position. It is said by people in India, who never read a thing in the original, who are content with taking scrappy material from the newspapers and who are further filled with the idea that in the outside world there is nothing, in India there is everything and in perfect form—people of that kind go about saying: "What is there in the League of Nations? there is nothing in it. British Empire has wickedly and satanically invented these reforms by which the people of India are, as it were, laid under a spell. They are made to believe that they are brought into the comity of Nations by being given an independent place, but never go to the League of Nations." In India, that is the criticism our people pass on our.

position in the League of Nations. They speak that "it is intended to reconcile our intelligentsia for ever and ever to a dependent position within the British Empire, by the camouflage of an independent place in the League of Nations. One or two similar camouflages and we believe that we would all be victimised." But there is no truth in either the suspicions or the statements which are founded on them. As a matter of fact, India is an independent member of the League of Nations. She takes her position there in her own right and not as a member of the British Empire. We sit there just like the members of Great Britain ; we fight and talk like them. Some one has remarked : " You will be tolerated only so long as you did like them. The moment you sit there and speak as independent judges, the moment you wish to vote differently from Great Britain, you will be made to realise what you are." That is what I used to hear before I went there. I tell you that, having been a non official all my time except now and then, notwithstanding an abandoned Moderate, I am sometimes in the habit of speaking out my mind. What about Sir William Meyer ? He was one of those hide-bound officials, a member of the Heaven-born Service. He rose to the top of the ladder, and when he was at the head of the Indian delegation we, the Maharao of Cutch and myself, have often had to restrain him in his outbursts of indignation. We had to restrain him because he went too far every time. During the five weeks that we sat with him, I know

that he cast our vote with our consent at least three different times against Great Britain. Some people say that we received secret instructions, to vote this way or that way. We did not receive any secret instructions, either from the Secretariat in Whitehall or from the Government of India. The decision of the Government of India was made clear to us by the memoranda which they prepared in advance. But I am not aware of a single instance where India Office instruction was sent to us. If it had been sent we should have repudiated it with indignation. India Office has nothing to do with it. It is the Government of India which we represent. That should be borne in mind by all representatives and by critics of the League.

Having stated so much, I ought to take you into our work. It is no secret either. I mention it for the purpose of showing that we have nothing to conceal though critics speak with anxiety about India, statements of a crude and unsympathetic character calculated to mislead. For instance, when the Assembly meets during those five weeks the delegations from the British Empire are in the habit of meeting together every now and then. When, for instance, Lord Balfour found some point difficulty concerning the British Empire, he sometimes asked us to dinner with him. Members from South Africa, Canada, etc., were asked to meet at dinner or at lunch. Then we discussed the matter together and very often we came to an agreement; but it occa-

sionally happened that we were unable to agree; then the understanding was that each delegation might take its own way where agreement was not arrived at. As I have said, our votes were cast differently from the votes of Great Britain at the Assembly in 1921. These meetings of the British delegation may be represented by you, if you are anxious, as the agency for bringing India and other countries into line with Great Britain. They are agents for the purpose of finding out a common basis to vote together. That much, of course, is due to our Sovereign Power and in yielding we do not yield in anything essential.

Let me now say a word about this opium question. Sometimes I have read of the ignoble part that the representatives of India played in the Assembly of 1921 over the opium question. It is not possible for me to take you over the whole ground. It is useful as the subject is coming up shortly for discussion. It is believed that we cursed for long years the bodies and souls of the Chinese people in order to add a few crores to our national wealth. I believe it was the case till very recently. But 12 or 15 years ago the Government of India deliberately renounced its opium revenue to the extent of 4 crores. 4 crores in those days meant what 12 crores are at present. During those years my master Gokhale used to stand up and say: "We would rather lose the revenue derived from opium, but we cannot afford to be charged before the world with this sin and shame." But China

has not been saved. The pity is when we cut down our revenue and curtailed the cultivation of opium just in that proportion or in far greater proportion China began to cultivate her own crop, and to-day the position is that 80 per cent of world's opium is produced in China. We produce about 50 per cent. As I told you before, owing to the fact that China had a powerful representation in the Council of the League, she figured as the injured party. At the time India was to be the recipient of the gratitude of the world for having out of her poverty sacrificed a great deal in order to save the people of China, we did not receive gratitude but we received plenty of abuse chiefly from a humanitarian opium society, established in America, the leading figure of which was a lady named Mrs. Hamilton Wright whom I had the honour of meeting in Washington. She had declared that I was a wicked man with a wicked tongue, who persuaded the Assembly to accept the resolution. She went about the country saying that my plan must be utterly revised. Since I left Washington she has started the cry once more, and as she is a powerful person her voice is heard. I am afraid that we cannot defend ourselves to the same extent. But the fact is this. It was held that the cultivation of opium exceeded the necessity of world's supply, that more opium was cultivated than was absolutely necessary for medicinal purposes and that India should make an endeavour to find out how much was really required and strictly adjust her

growth to those requirements. We said: We are quite willing to produce no more opium than is necessary, that is to say, as much as is necessary. You do not know how opium is produced and is used in India. You must leave us to judge. But if you put down in your resolution the phrase 'for medicinal purposes' it would be of gravest possible difficulty to India for the reason that the phrase 'medical purpose' would only be properly defined by doctors trained in the western system of medicine. The full use of opium was not yet known outside India. In India, opium was used as a prophylactic for malaria and as a powerful preventive and curative for certain diseases." And therefore we pressed the Assembly and the Council to put the words "for medicinal and legitimate purposes." They contend that in introducing the word 'legitimate' I have introduced really a word of disastrous portent, so that by covering ourselves under that word we can proceed as before to cultivate even more than before and strangle the growing nations all around us. Mrs. Hamilton Wright is trying once more and is using all her influence. These humanitarian societies are not dominated by experts, and technically speaking, they are dominated by humanitarians, with most legitimate intentions, like Mrs. Hamilton Wright, who however are ignorant and dominated by the idea that, being unselfish and dis-interested in the matter and engaged in the championship, as it were, of poor peoples, they are entitled to say anything and to do anything. The

humanitarian who runs away from what science and practical necessity prescribe for you is one of the serious enemies of mankind. They can make much mischief and create widespread harm. What did Mrs. Hamilton Wright's followers do in order to bring their point of view forcibly before the nations of the world? You may remember that they appealed to the Indian National Congress. They said to the Indian National Congress: "You are the repositories before the world of the good name and standing of India. Are you going to allow a man like so and so to come and spoil your name before the League of Nations, where the conscience of humanity is incarnated? Here is your representative, a non-official, speaking voluntarily in the name of 300 millions of India, who says deliberately opium is necessary for your people. Are you going to allow a man of that kind in your name to say so." In order to arouse the indignation of our own people that was the trick played. But behind it there really is an excellent purpose which, although for the moment it is inconvenient to us, I should not omit to mention to you. I should like the Indian National Congress really to debate the matter but of course they had no time to debate such things. Whichever body takes it and goes into it must have a thorough and informal discussion on these matters. But there was, as I said, an inner meaning to the reference to the Indian National Congress. The vote that is to be cast by a nation and its delegation in the Assembly, the way that we are to speak in the

Assembly should be determined not by the Government of the country but by the people of the country. Our delegation ought really to represent the public opinion of India and not the views of the Government of India or White Hall. You may say it is only in India that this contrast between the opinion of the people and the opinion of the Government is of much significance. In democratic countries where the Government is the creature of the people there are no such contrarieties between the opinion of the people and of the Government. It is quite wrong to suppose that. In matters with which the Assembly is vitally and primarily concerned, that is in international affairs, in matters of boundary disputes, in matters that generally lead to peace and war, secret compacts, alliances, entente—in those matters people generally are ignorant, uninformed, liable to be swayed by unworthy prejudices and it is just one of those in which a great deal of harm might be done by the unwise and hasty interference of the opinion of an ignorant nation. Therefore these delicate matters have always, even in democratic countries, been supposed to be the particular charge of wise people who through hereditary tradition have dealt with those matters and in whom there is a special capacity supposed to be present for the purpose of carrying on the affairs of high import. In such matters the commonest thing for the Government of a country is to act sometimes without being able to consult the people. For knowing that the people's wishes would run in differ-

ent directions Government have acted in one direction and the people subsequently have seen the wisdom of standing behind their Government. So it happens that this distinction between the opinion of a Government and the opinion of a people is of use. Dr. Wilson, to whom we owe the inception of this great idea of the League of Nations, laid down in so many words that the League of Nations was to be the meeting place not of the representatives of the Governments or States engaged in making peace and war, but of the representatives of the peoples of the world. He said it is to be a League of Nations, not to be a League of Governments controlling nations. Since it is to be a League of Nations it is but just and proper that if affairs of great importance arise they should be referred to the people for judgment, and when the people have been properly educated then the Government may take that opinion and present it at the Assembly of the League. There is one important respect in which Government is apt to act hastily. The history of our time abundantly shows that where what is called the state of a Nation, its vital, its traditional matters are concerned, a Government is only too ready to plunge the people into war. Without trying to prevent war by all manner the practice hitherto has been for Governments to be always prepared for war. When your country is prepared for war, when your soldiers are athirst for blood, when your guns are of the utmost efficiency, it is difficult to prevent war. That is how time after

time history has recorded judgment on international war. On such occasions it was the people that decided the issue and not the Government. It is to prevent wars of that kind that we have to educate the people fully so that if the Government was apt to run mad people might hold them and reconcile them. It is in order that we may be able to do that all over the world and especially in every part of the British Empire, they have started what is known as the League of Nations Union, for the purpose of creating a public opinion which should stand behind a nation and compel its delegation to act in the particular way. I will tell you how we have already begun to feel the want of a powerful body of well-educated, well-trained people in these subjects. Take, for instance, the question of ratification. Now ratification works out this way. After a good deal of consultation amongst the nations of the world a subject is brought by a resolution or recommendation and is adopted at the Assembly. But although it may have been adopted unanimously by all the representatives of the people it is considered necessary to preserve the sovereignty of each subject in its full form and therefore even although an unanimous decision has been arrived at by the Assembly it is not immediately operated, but we have to wait for another six months, 12 months or 18 months, before each nation has received a copy from the Secretariat of the League of this resolution or recommendation, and has gone into it very carefully; again it may be consulted by public-

bodies and then ratified. We approve of the decision so that there is every guarantee of full circumspection being brought into play in the course of action. We found in the matter of Africa, to get a ratification a resolution is adopted after a great deal of deliberation and plenty of visits while nations take months and months before they send in their ratification. It is not only for this ratification but also for other things they have to subscribe.

The great nations of the world like Great Britain, France, etc., do not like the idea of every little nation just like Panama with only 35,000 inhabitants having a vote. One nation, one democracy, is established amongst the nations. These great nations resent it sometimes (Here the lecturer gave one or two instances of how the great nations resented the idea of small nations having a vote).

As it is, the League of Nations is not the League of Governments. The British Nation is anxious that the moral authority of the League of Nations should be maintained. Very many things concerning peace and war and the creation of powerful guns, powerless neighbours, may come in and a Government, grabbing, aggressive, unscrupulous, may come and commit their people to courses of action which were extraordinary, and that is why the League of Nations is founded so as to become the exponent of peace to mankind, and it could perform that purpose only by a wide awake public opinion which knows no race, which keeps its Government up to the mark and always safeguards

the League as the international body whose efficiency and moral authority must be maintained.

In the British Empire everywhere, there is a League of Nations Union. There is none in India, and we know as a matter of fact that there are several people who are really interested in the subject and who would, if occasion permitted, bring about such a Union in India, so that our people should be educated, and appreciate the value of the League not for the Indian Government, not certainly for British Empire, but for our own Nation. We would, if occasion permitted, start these Unions. But what is in the way? I hope I am not blaming anybody. But, at the present moment, the prevailing tendency is for India to shut herself from all contact with the outside world, even from London, where affairs of momentous importance are transacted; we have withdrawn our representation. The National Congress has abandoned foreign propaganda and the Liberal Federation maintains a feeble hold. India, we are told, is a country only of grievances and of nothing more. She has turned her back on the great position which she can assert to-day amongst the nations of the world. You never can cure your grievances, you will only multiply them ten-fold. The people of India must come out boldly to assert their rights as they are amongst the nations of the world in the League. They are just like others. Why not assert full rights? What is the good of turning back? We are a part of the world and our wise and strong friends

like Dr. Annie Besant say further that in the future, India should make her own contribution to the civilisation of Europe, and perhaps when that contribution comes out, it will be of a partly spiritual and moral character. She could not do it till she recognised that there were peoples round her whose movements were in a sense her own movements, that she was but a part of the family of Nations and that she should interest herself not merely in the rectification of abuses in India but the rectification of abuses of the world. For the world is still a sore-stricken world, and if India tried to put her own house in order and took centuries in the operation, while the houses of her neighbours were in the rotten condition, she should no more have achieved her task than she has done to-day. Our grievances are profound. But great and profound as they are, they can only be attacked if we used all our powers and all our energies, not merely in India, but outside India amongst the peoples of the whole world. As I went about I came back with this profound impression that an ignorant India, a prejudiced India, could not be of much use to the world. The world, as I said, is a family. We ought to do our duty to the family of which we are members. We must travel more, we must try and understand other people much more. We must learn from them a good deal more and I take no shame at all in confessing that we have a good deal to learn even in the moral and spiritual directions from the rest of the world. We have lost our great teachings,

Nobbdy is to blame. We are the descendents of a great civilisation. Our rishis of yore saw all and knew everything. I am proud of them as anybody else. But what right have we to say that therefore we are more spiritual, we are more wise than the rest of them. We take the names of the Rishis. We live in the land which they inhabited. We inherit their civilisation, but no more belong to them in spirit than any other nation in the world. We have travelled far, far indeed from their ideal and if we are to try to follow them, we should reconquer not in the way which Non-Co-operation will revive, but we should reconquer in the cities and marts of the world outside India as well as within India.

Memorandum to the Delhi Conference.

[The following Memorandum was submitted by the Rt. Hon. Sastri to the Delhi Conference presided over by Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru on the 12th Feb. 1923.]

ONE set of people believe that if the Indian Progressives forbore altogether to agitate for political advance, the operation of the Government of India Act of 1919 would automatically expand the constitution and that in course of time, without any strong or disorderly action on the part of the politically-minded classes, the attainment of Swaraj is certain to come about and that it would come about at a safe and comfortable pace, taking say, a few decades in the process. On the other hand, a considerable section of the educated classes in India maintain that the present Act was passed to meet unexampled emergency, that those who wish for further steps towards responsible government must make another emergency and that to trust the Section about the Commission at the end of ten years to take effect as a matter of course, would be to court stagnation at present and the final defeat of our national purposes. The latter view would require our neglecting minor advantages and reforms, and heading straight for complete res-

possible government by vigorous and persistent agitation. The Liberal line of thought lies between these two extremes. It credits the average British politician with a certain amount of good faith, but knows at the same time that he will abandon the true and just course of action if the other party is not wakeful and determined to have his due. To cease utterly from agitation might lead the British representatives in India to think that the India was quite content with his lot and desired no more. He himself is accustomed to a very different style of behaviour in politics. When he has any political cravings unsatisfied, he does not rest nor allow the authorities to rest. The present stand-still in India and the tendency on the part of the Secretary of State to tighten his grip on Indian affairs are only manifestations of an essentially human quality, namely, to act only under compelling pressure. Some years ago, the Government of Lord Minto just before inaugurating the Reforms of 1909, protested that it moved forward in response to no external stimulus, but of its own sweet will and accord. But it protested so much that the public scarcely believed it. Nowadays such a pretence is not made. It is commonly understood that the Government of India, whether the part of it in England or the part of it in India, is not impelled to beneficent activity by abstract considerations of justice, the freedom of peoples, or their right to govern themselves. When they profess to weigh carefully the capacity of the electorates or the virtues of their representatives, or assess with

scrupulous exactitude the precise proportion of the higher services which must be occupied by the British element, they are thinking all the time "how much can we keep, and how little need we yield." Of course, I am not cynic enough to deny that the higher considerations are present in their minds, but their decisions on any given occasion are governed rather by more practical considerations and the expediencies of the moment. On our side, we must be prepared along both lines. While ready at all times to produce our testimonials and title deeds, we must manipulate the political forces of the country so as to be able to exert at any given moment all the constitutional pressure of which we are capable. It is our conviction that the power to exert constitutional pressure is exactly measured by the progress we make under the present constitution, by the use to which we put our new privileges and opportunities and by the prosperity and strength which we build up for our nation. For this reason, we cannot slacken in the slightest degree our efforts to ameliorate the material and moral condition of our people and evoke, on the common ground of our national and provincial legislatures, a bond of brotherhood and fellowship amongst the various communities of the land. An attempt at constructing a system of national education in the true sense of the word, at improving sanitation and through that means the vitality and efficiency of the people, and at building up our indus-

tries and manufactures, is no bar to constitutional advance or a dangerous distraction, but a necessary condition of it, in as much as it furnishes a practical proof of the utility of political power and draws an ever increasing circle of appreciative citizens into its pursuit. That is why we cannot afford to countenance, even for a moment, the morbid cry "paralyse the government, paralyse the administration and paralyse all national work till Swaraj is attained." We part company decisively from those who have no use for the current constitution and the legislatures created under it, whether they profess to boycott them or seek, by entering, to destroy them. We insist on our allies having faith in these institutions, no matter whether the faith be large or small.

It is fairly clear that the ten year limit for the next stage of advance cannot be maintained. By a vote, which, if not unanimous, was at least without contradiction, the Assembly recommended that the matter be taken up within the statutory period and in this recommendation members of the Government and the non-official Europeans either concurred or acquiesced. By its failure to take action, not requiring the approval of Parliament, in furtherance of the Reform Scheme, Government has lent justification to the attitude of suspicion and distrust with which nearly all sections of the public regard the intentions of the Suzerain Power. And it is desirable from every point of view not to allow this suspicion and distrust to grow unchecked for eight years more.

The period of change is difficult for all concerned and must be abridged as much as possible. Government at the centre has to carry on without the support of any party and subsist partly on the tolerant spirit of the new legislators, partly on their internal dissensions; and except the spirit of pedantry or excessive obstinacy, one does not see any conclusive reason for delay. And as both Mr. Montagu and Mr. Fisher have stated in Parliament, there is nothing in the Act to preclude a comprehensive enquiry within ten years.

It is common ground among Indian Progressives that provincial autonomy should be included in our next move towards the goal. The precise contents of that expression are hard to enumerate, but the essence is that the Governor should be more or less a constitutional chief and his Cabinet should consist exclusively of Ministers chosen from and responsible to the legislature. The ill-defined demarcation between the Central Government and the Local Government, the continuation, on however small a scale, of British personnel in the higher services, and one or two other conditions, may militate against the integrity of provincial autonomy. But they are inheritances from our past and must be tolerated for a time as anomalies.

An irresponsible government over a group of autonomous administrations would be an incongruity. At three or four meetings, the Liberal Party has demanded that, to the extent to which it is possible

to-day, even the Central Government should be made responsible to the Assembly. The obvious limitations are the Military, Political and Foreign Departments. The Ecclesiastical is hardly worth mentioning, though in reason it is difficult to defend its continuance. Military policy, like the position of Indian States, must be left to the personal conduct of the Governor General. This does not mean, however, that Military expenditure should continue to be non-votable. It is not an unreasonable demand to make that beyond a figure agreed upon as a fixed and irreducible item, expenditure on the defence of the country must be subject to discussion and vote by the popular chamber. Theoretical considerations, like the interdependence of autonomy in the civil administration and autonomy in military administration and the necessity of the two marching together in equal strides, can have no application to Indian politics, while British military policy has been disfigured from the outset by distrust of the loyalty of the people.

Now that the Secretary of State has refused to take action pursuant to the resolution adopted by the Legislative Assembly in September 1921, what is the best means of attaining our end? Regular constitutions laid on democratic lines are based in the last resort on the will of the people as disclosed at a general election. Large measures cannot be undertaken by a Parliament which has no mandate for the purpose. And where there is such a man-

date, nothing should ordinarily come in the way of its fulfilment. Now that India has a constitution based on direct popular constituencies, however rudimentary it may be, a forward move in the direction of democracy must be based on the desire of the constitution as expressed at the next election. Of course in the provinces, a number of local issues will complicate the matter. The election of the Legislative Assembly, however, can be fought on a clear and simple issue, viz., the acquisition by peaceful and constitutional methods of complete provincial autonomy and of responsibility in the Central Government, exclusive of defence and foreign affairs. At the provincial elections also, the issue can be brought more or less into the foreground, although it can only occupy it along with other issues which to the ordinary elector will appear equally important. To ensure a thorough education of the electorates, this Conference proposes to put the subject before them under the auspices of an influential organisation and keep up the propaganda till the candidates to the next councils announce themselves and carry it on as an election cry. Such preliminary work is absolutely indispensable and it is to be hoped that both candidates and their friends and well-wishers, in fact, all men of political influence will take their share of this educative work in an ungrudging and zealous spirit. Assuming that a majority of those elected to the new Assembly and the new Councils have received such a mandate, the next step would be for them to elect

representatives from themselves to an all-India Convention. It would be well if the Assembly and the Councils did so at a regular session convened by the Governor-General or the Governor. Should, however, the countenance of the executive be not forthcoming, it would be well also, though not so well. The Legislators in each place who respected their mandate would not be deterred by official displeasure, but would meet of their own accord and bring about the all-India Convention. The duty of this Convention would be to propose the precise steps necessary for the purpose of fulfilling their mandate, which is the attainment of Swaraj as qualified above. It might be helpful to empower the convention at the outset to co-opt men and women of established political reputation, who are not members of any legislature and who express their general sympathy with the aim and methods of the convention. My personal bias is towards building on the present constitution and I should, therefore, favour the idea of introducing modifications into the present Act, so as to convert it into an instrument of responsible Government. Possibly, however, the convention may prefer to indicate the outlines of a distinct constitution. The important thing is for its proposals to be published broadcast in the country. When sufficient time has been allowed for public criticism and suggestions, the Convention would meet again, revise proposals and formulate them finally. A small deputation of leading men from different parts of

India would then be appointed by the Convention to take the proposals to Great Britain and negotiate with His Majesty's Government.

The plan roughly sketched above is doubtless capable of improvement in the light of experience and political sagacity of the members of the Conference. To some persons it may appear too elaborate, but in my humble judgment it is none too elaborate when we consider the great ends in view or the amount of prejudice and opposition to be encountered. No step should be omitted which was necessary to swell the volume of opinion behind the movement or which was calculated to win respect for the actual suggestions contained in the final scheme. Unfriendly critics and perhaps some patriots of an academic disposition might evolve grandiose ideas of self-determination by the masses of the people or a universal referendum. We must sternly refuse to be tempted by these attractive notions and content ourselves with working through the present constitution and up to its limits.

Too much emphasis cannot be laid on the importance of giving the all-India Convention fairly wide terms of reference and a certain amount of latitude as to the methods of work. If the personnel were carefully chosen, their deliberations and conclusions will command respectful attention both in and out of India. It is not to be expected that their efforts would be crowned with success at once. On the other hand the probability is that, under the present

Conservative Government, farsighted counsels will not prevail. In this case, what should be done? I do not hesitate to answer that another effort should be made and if necessary, yet another. We must win in the end. Besides, all the time the Convention is at work, the legislatures would function as usual and the work of nation-building go on continuously under the provisions of the present Act. I would not listen to the advice of those who would back up the Convention or the deputation by threats of labour troubles, students' strikes or civil disobedience of sorts. Constitutional agitation has been rewarded before and will yet be rewarded. A sudden catastrophe may frustrate all our hopes like some untoward development in Kenya, but to the extent that we can control events, our influence must be cast on the side of faith, hope and charity.

Gokhale and his Life-Work

[At the Gokhale Anniversary Celebration of the Deccan Sabha on Monday the 19th Feb. 1923 when a large crowd of people had assembled on the spacious Gokhale Hall grounds, Poona, to hear the Rt. Hon'ble F. S. Srinivasa Sastri, P. C., speak on Gokhale and his life work, he said :—

TO-day for the 8th time the citizens of Poona are assembled to recall the memory of the man, who shed luster on his time and—added to the glory of the name of India. It is not here alone that people are met together for the purpose. In various other cities, in India, I am sure, similar meetings are held and loving memories exchanged about the great man, whom to-day, I am trying, if possible, to recall in my own way first to myself and to you.

POSTHUMOUS RENOWN

Most of you here who are not exactly of the younger generation perhaps knew him personally and knew him well too. I knew him at a rather late age and it was perhaps to indicate the point at which I knew him that the chairman's vivid narrative of the great man's life broke up suddenly at the point where he came to the establishment of the Servants of India Society. That Mr. Gokhale should be so

honoured and that his name should be so cherished is a phenomenon of which the real significance is worth trying to understand. He is one of those, who it may be said, enjoyed a posthumous renown greater than that which in their lives rewarded them. I could say that while he lived, much of his accomplishments was mixed up with a great deal of current day controversy and it was not possible to separate what was permanent and enduring from what was merely transitory and liable to question by opponents during his life.

MISUNDERSTANDING AND SUSPICION.

Let it also be remembered that it was not only from Indian opponents that Mr. Gokhale during his life suffered; the Government and generally the Anglo-Indian community using the word Anglo-Indian in the larger and truer sense and not in that narrow sense in which it has since been appropriated by a certain community, Government and the Anglo-Indian community to the very end of his time continued to suspect, to misunderstand and to misrepresent him. His efforts were continually thwarted by a Government that would not understand, or understanding would not appreciate. It was, therefore, somewhat of a surprise to a good many of us to learn that after his death Government and the European Community, no less than his apparent opponents among ourselves, had really and truly held him in their hearts as one of the greatest men of the time, as one who did for India and the Empire mighty service, one therefore,

whom it was necessary to honour, and whose memory ought to be commemorated. To us, who knew him fully intimately and had followed him in his anxieties and trials, and rejoiced in his triumphs and his honours;—to us, therefore, it was a feeling of unmixed joy when we heard that his fellow workers in the Legislative Council of the Empire, as it was before, and his fellow workers, of that Council had determined to raise a bust in his honour which now stands in the ante-chamber at Delhi to remind me and others, how he had contributed to make that old Council a live instrument for the good of India, a means of promoting her welfare, night and day a theatre, as it were, where he played a large part telling all along everything worth knowing about India, all about her finance, all about her people, all about the great things done and the greater things still to do, the place, where if anywhere in India, he deserves to be cherished and his example to be remembered for ever by those whose lot is to function in that place.

WHAT WOULD HE HAVE DONE

*Dealing with the question, "what would Gokhale have done had he been alive?" Mr. Sastri said:—*It is extraordinary, and I have often felt a surprise, as I think, that how many people among rival workers, in the political field to-day, have really set up a claim to have understood him best of all, and to be standing at the exact spot, where if his life had been spared, he would be standing to-day. All of us could not be right.

So many of us doing things the opposite of one another, teaching principles and doctrines which flatly contradict each other, all of us could certainly not be true interpreters of the same person's doctrines and teachings.

UNION OF POLITICAL PARTIES.

One striking illustration occurs to me of the way in which this question presses hard on the mind and heart of an anxious public worker, In the year 1915 the year of his passing away and the succeeding year, in those two years, there was witnessed all over India and in the Deccan, if you can recall, an attempt at reuniting all the political parties in the country and making one strong united endeavour by presenting the claims of educated India for a higher political life and for better emancipated political institutions. I did my humble share, let me now put my claim forward I did my humble share in bringing about that reunion to some extent. A friend who had known Mr. Gokhale very well in his time and who had also been his great friend and trusted associate to this day, is never tired of saying "You were among those who in those two years tried to bring back into the Congress those, who had seceded from it in 1907 in the troublous times after Surat, you were among those who were continually in favour of a reconciliation", and here comes up the unkind part. He added invariably "You must now regret it all your life." Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, here is a bit of my confession. I have not regretted it even for one moment.

As I now recall it, it was that reunion of the different political parties, it was the circumstance which enabled us to speak with one voice, it was the circumstance why not say, for a moment, the parties represented by Mr. Gokhale on one side and by Mr. Tilak on the other side, could stand on one common platform and speak with one voice on behalf of India. It was this fact that led to the demands put forward by us in Lucknow. It was that fact that led to the famous Congress-League Scheme. It was that fact that led to the Hindu-Moslem compact of which we hear so much now-a-days. Ah! I love those years and their memory, 1915, and 1916, I love them the more, Ladies and Gentlemen, because I feel that in using my influence, such as it was, to bring about this reunion, I was only carrying out one of the life purposes of my dear Master. (hear hear). I well remember now he used feelingly to say, Indian politics must not be left muddier than they are to-day or our great men must be in a better position to understand, each other, far better. Alas, if we cannot do so in our time we are bound in our duty to the future to see that our successors, the coming generations, have an atmosphere of better peace. Better mutual understandings; political controversy, which cannot be completely eliminated, conducted however on purer, on a more serious and more patriotic basis. It is our duty to bring together, if possible, the warring factions on the political field. I am therefore, not ashamed of what was done in

those years. Neither am I ashamed of the consequence, for it seems to me, that reconciliation, brief as it was, had a very important consequence not merely of raising our political life to a higher level but of laying the foundations for what to-day is often described by the more hopeful among us as the promise of a better day. Without that reunion it is impossible to conceive our Congress-League scheme: it is impossible to conceive of a Chelmsford-Montagu Mission to India; it is impossible to conceive of that scheme of representative institutions which, imperfect as it may be, is in my judgment (and the judgment unfortunately of that class to which I belong as politician), in reality the earnest of greater reforms and wider liberties to follow.

REFORMS OF 1909

I quite remember the time when in 1908 Mr. Gokhale returned after arduous labours in England with Lord Morley and members of his cabinet, when Mr. Gokhale returned to expound to us the reform proposals of that time. Ladies and Gentlemen, to read the reform proposals of 1908 as they eventuated in 1909 the succeeding year, to read them to-day, you would certainly think as I do that you were in an India separated from that time not by the space of 14 years but by the space of about 100 years. I implore you to put away the harsh judgment of the day, and if you can, go back and read Mr. Gokhale's exposition of those reforms. To think to-day that at time there was no member, no Indian

member on any of those Legislative Councils, to think that we had no power to move resolutions of a far-reaching character to think that you never thought of a majority in any of the councils and you ventured as a great political ambition to have a non-official nominated majority in the provincial councils and none at all in the central council, to think of those days, and to think of the time in which we are, is really to be given the means of judging the relative advance of time and a measure, somewhat true it may be, somewhat untrue it may be, but a fairly trustworthy measure of how within 14 years even India had advanced by leaps and bounds. And yet many are found to-day who use the language of despair and say, as on that occasion the proposals, that Mr. Gokhale then brought from England, our constitutional advance met with the same depreciation and for a wonder he used language in their defence nearly paralleled by the language, which some of us are using to-day. How closely we are near to Mr. Gokhale and yet how far. It is a wonder to think.

STUDENTS AND POLITICS

His teachings on various subjects I have recently been refreshing my memory by a reference to this volume of his speeches, his teachings are in many ways precisely those that seem to be needed. Take the Hindu-Moslem problem for example. It was allowed to rest for a time but now once more has come back into a vigorous life to vex the politician for several years, I fear. Take the question. Pronounce-

ments then made by Mr. Gokhale have a peculiar appositeness which as the days go on will appear clearer and clearer. Take again, what he told to the students of their duties. Nothing, nothing that I can imagine could be more wholesome advice to the students to-day, than the words which in Madras, in Poona, and in Allahabad, Mr. Gokhale addressed to them, I hope, with their approbation for the time being at least. How would he have been horrified, if he were alive to-day to hear people saying openly and as a matter of definite principle and rule of political action, how would he have been horrified to-day to hear people saying in political campaigns and especially in those aspects of them, where great sacrifices are involved, where perhaps lives may be turned away from their perspective and marred for ever, in those political campaigns and in these arduous parts of them, it is perfectly legitimate to use the innocent and enthusiastic student at College, put him in front, fight from behind his back as a shelter, ruin young men, mar their lives, disfigure their ambitions, give a twist to the ethical basis on which their opening lives should be fashioned, corrupt and debase them with the touch of practical politics. Let them not study these from the broad academical standpoint examining fundamentals and principles from the true spirit of the searcher of the truth. What care we for the truth, they say. Teach the student your distorted views of life. Give them a vision entirely out of perspective. Bring them out into the arena. What

matters it if a generation is lost ? We have so many generations still to think of, and yet one generation misused, corrupted and ruined in that way must mean similar destruction of the prospects of several generations. Oh, my young friends, if you will in the solemnity of this hour, when we are handing our common thoughts, I hope, with one common aim ; if in the solemnity of this hour, I can tell you one thing, it is this. They are not wise. They are not your friends. Certainly, they do not serve the best interests of India who seek to enlist in the near battle of political life your untried enthusiasm, your unregulated zeal, your patriotism, alas : which in your own good time certainly is bound to bear an admirable fruit ; but which called into play before its time, while immature and undeveloped, is sure to recoil with infinite detriment on your life, on the fortunes of your families and let me add on the fortune of that common mother, whom you would fain serve. That was one of the great regrets of Mr. Gokhale. Then, again, how often was it Mr. Gokhale's lot to hear the same doctrine of despair that one hears all round. Oh, this is camouflage, this is fraud, this is the wicked politics of the West, trying to deceive the innocent politician of the East, I wonder how conditions are very similar. I could occupy you here listening to me while I read pages from this book in which he in 1917-1908 had to denounce publicly and privately the same doctrine that some of us are continually preaching, but I am afraid, not always to attentive ears.

LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

I love to remember him also as one, who in Calcutta for years, was the non-official leader of the opposition, as it were, in the Legislative Council. How, I remember the great occasion upon which it was my privilege to assist him and watch him in his labours. I remember, how Ladies and Gentlemen, in Calcutta, who never would come ordinarily to the Council Room, would apply for tickets long before when they knew a great debate was on which Mr. Gokhale would initiate. I was there when he spoke on elementary education. I was there next year when he introduced his Bill. I was there when he attacked expenditure and all the time he held the house, every single member of them, the proudest officer would come to him and ask questions. The Viceroy would listen to him as he would not to many another and even though while the general record is a failure, if you were to count up the small matters in which Mr. Gokhale's suggestions were approved and carried into effect, they would make a goodly catalogue. I remember also Mr. Gokhale on another occasion. I remember him in the Society Building walking up and down while he was suffering from the heart affliction, which finally carried him off. I remember him holding his heart tight, for he was then suffering from acute pain, but still moving about and refusing to listen to all suggestions that he should take rest, because he was then engaged upon a momentous task which required

all his thinking and in which unfortunately it was not possible for us, his junior assistants, either to relieve his troubles or take his place in the smallest way. He was then, Ladies and Gentlemen, you will recall, conducting delicate negotiations by telegrams that passed between Lord Hardinge and Mahatma Gandhi in South Africa, those delicate negotiations which finally took shape as you have noted in the Peace, which enabled Mr. Gandhi to put down his labours for a time and come to his own country. During the time of those labours, it was a pain, it was a pleasure, it was a privilege, it was a joy to watch how Mr. Gokhale spent the last strength he had in passing telegrams and interpreting cablegrams which nearly every hour came at prodigious lengths and he knew neither his rest nor his pain.

MR. SASTRI OR MAHATMA GANDHI

Ladies and Gentleman, I have many a recollection which I would share with you, but I must come now to the very end of my own experience. During the last two years people have often told me that Mr. Gokhale named me on his death-bed as his successor in the Society. A point like that is too sacred for me. I have hitherto let the statement pass unchallenged. But it is not true. Mr. Gokhale did not name any body as his successor and it is not for purely egoistic purposes that I bring it in, but I have another purpose which I presently shall unfold. Perhaps Mr. Gokhale did not totally drop some suspicion that he always had that I had a leaning towards the

other side in politics and that I was only an extremist in disguise. Also be it remembered that at that time Mahatma Gandhi had returned from South Africa and Mr. Gokhale had hoped that he would become a member of the Servants of India Society and he could, in that case take pity on us. Perhaps it was these two considerations that had a share in his determination not to say a word about what would happen to the Society after him. It was also, Ladies and Gentlemen, the dominant thought and purpose of Mr. Gokhale's life that he should make none of those mistakes with regard to his work, which many another wrapt up in it, might have done. I hope, I am not asking too much on your part if you would permit me to dwell on what I consider in my own way as the outstanding feature of Mr. Gokhale's almost transcendental personality. As you all know he loved his work, to such an extent that none of its details was too small for him. He bestowed infinite pain on it in order that it might be perfect. Nevertheless as in the case of truly great, as in the case of those who know that time works great changes, he felt that it would be wrong if he tied down the discretion of the members of the Servants of India Society to any course of action which however clear to him might not in their judgment, after him, appear to be the best in the circumstances. Many of us accumulate fortunes. Many of us build up institutions in our lives. Many of us put our hands to dear work which we cherish beyond our

lives, but do we not often make the mistake of tying down the hands of our successors? Do not we wish that our property should be sent in certain definite line, whether it be for the property or something else? We don't care and we sympathise with the dying man's wishes and we desire that our work should be done in a particular way when we build it up on the idea to which we have given our lives. How we wish that things after us should be the same more or less as if we live perpetually. How we wish that our undeveloped thought should mould future times and conduct them in their grooves! Too often has a dying man's wish expressed by him in the hour of death in all its solemnity bound his successor to a course of action which may be unwise, which may be inexpedient which may not be calculated to further the largest purpose of the country. I make no doubt in my mind that in the final hour of his life these rare detachments came to him. He said to himself, for I know the way in which "he said to himself." I am here, he said to himself, "Now I am going." This work passes into other people's hands. It is for them to judge what is best. My opinion of what is best, these faithful disciples will doubtless cherish, perhaps, however, it may not be to their good. Let me leave them untrammelled." So by a final stroke of that "sanyasa," the true spirit of which the elect ones of India alone know and realise; with one mighty effort of detachment, he took himself out of his work and put restraint upon his speech, which inspite of

repeated enquiry and imploring requests for suggestions, he kept rigorously. He would not tell us whom he chose to lead us and in that wish his greatness was even as he had shown his greatness in all the previous deeds.

RESTRAINT AND MODERATION

Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, I have only one more word to say. We have dwelt for a brief period with the great man, shared his thoughts and revived his memory. The only thing, that I would say, is that even as we appreciate and admire Mr. Gokhale, we must try and appreciate the great principles of enduring truth to which he had dedicated his life. This book* that I have contains all his important speeches and writings. It is of a goodly size as you see it in my hand. Let me add I am not interested in its publication or in its financial success. But I can assure you of one thing, that although they refer to a period now seemingly remote, I can assure you Young Students, whom I have the opportunity of speaking to-day that a perusal of a selection of these speeches made to them by their professors, would be a far more helpful contribution to make for politics than if they are invited to do by some of those to whom they look for political guidance. Read them and you will find there plenty of inspiration, plenty of sober facts, plenty of arresting figures but plenty also of wise sayings and political maxims,— plenty of lessons

Gokhale's Speeches. G. A. Natesan & Co., Madras.
Price Rs. 4.

drawn from the history and peoples similarly situated to those of India, who had as great struggles as we have had, in recovering their independence, in reality by pursuing the path of restraint and moderation. I venture to speak that word to-day of restraint and moderation, of fair dealing even with opponents,—people, who followed the lesson of the great one that had lived and died before men who live in the sight of God and for the benefit of their fellow-creatures, men who always bore aloft the flag not merely of their country but in doing so felt that they were holding aloft the interests of humanity and the interests of truth, men who never shrank from following the path dictated by considerations of faith, hope and charity.

Resolution in the Council of State on Kenya.

The Rt. Hon. Sastri moved a Resolution in the Council of State on the 5th March, 1923, on the rights and status of Indians in Kenya. In moving the Resolution he said:—*

IN speaking on this Resolution it is my great desire to avoid all rhetoric or attempt to excite feelings. I will confine myself merely to a statement of view because I believe that the facts in themselves are such that they carry their own conclusion. In the first place, I think in the course of public discussion upon this subject, there has been some mistake of an important character which, if I may, I would try to put right. Those who have advocated the Indian

* "That this Council recommends to the Governor-General-in-Council that he be pleased to convey by telegraphic message to His Majesty's Government the view of this Council that no settlement regarding the political rights and status of Indian settlers in the Crown Colony of Kenya would satisfy the people of India unless Indians in Kenya are granted full and equal rights of citizenship with European settlers.

And this Council records its indignant protest at the reported threats of violence on the part of the latter and fully trusts that His Majesty's Government will take effective steps to prevent any such outbreak and to afford the Indians resident in Kenya the necessary protection.

And this Council records its emphatic conviction that no restrictions on new immigration from India will be acceptable to public opinion here."

case have grounded themselves more or less expressly upon the Resolution which in the year 1921 the Imperial Conference of Prime Ministers adopted on the subject. I venture to think, having been a party to that Resolution, that it is somewhat of a serious mistake. That Resolution, Sir, was the result of a case that the Government of India put forward. I am in a position to say, and the public are in a position to judge from the memorandum of the Government of India published at the time, that our case did not concern any of the Crown Colonies. It was concerned solely with the Self-Governing Dominions of the Empire, and the case was also argued, as I have a right to state, solely on the ground that it concerned itself with the Self-Governing Dominions of the Empire. The case for the Crown Colonies rests on equity and does not derive in the least from that Resolution. We have got pledges of equity dating far back in the history of India. We have got it asserted again and again on high and solemn authority, and it did not require the Resolution of the Imperial Conference of the year 1921 for the first time to give vitality to our claim for equity of treatment in the Crown Colonies. I make this repudiation at this early stage of my speech because I am particularly anxious that nobody here should carry the impression that the implication of that Resolution applies to Kenya Colony. That Resolution cites in the very beginning the right of every community in the Empire to exclude elements of the Empire's

population which it does not care to assimilate. We have given that right to the Self-Governing Dominions and to India. We have not given that right, and if the people of India have a voice in the matter, they will not allow the right to be given, to the Crown Colonies. The whole claim of the Self-Governing Dominions in the matter is based upon the fact that, whatever the equities, whatever the rights and wrongs of the case, a people who can govern themselves, have a right in the last resort to say who shall compose the population. No Crown Colony, neither Ceylon, nor Fiji, nor Mauritius, nor Kenya, has yet acquired the right to say who shall form the population. If it is to be determined entirely by the Colonial Office, the Colonial Office, being a part of the British Cabinet, cannot settle the matter without amicable arrangements with the India Office; and the Colonial Office and the India Office, agreeing together, will determine these matters and not the people of Kenya. I am very anxious to make this repudiation also for the reason that, when this is once granted, the expression "the people of Kenya," "the community resident in Kenya" has, by a sort of verbal jugglery which I cannot understand, been applied solely to the white population of Kenya, as if they were the only community who had a right to determine who shall go to Kenya and who shall not.

Having made that point perfectly clear, so far as I can, let me now proceed to say that our claim to equality is, even as regards Kenya, rather academic

and theoretical to-day. We assert the right to equality but we are quite content—and I wish more general recognition were given to that circumstance than has been given to it before—in the achievement of equality to proceed by stages. For what are the demands of our people in Kenya and what are the demands that the Government of India and the Secretary of State for India have so long supported? In the first place, we do not ask for universal suffrage as the European community there enjoys to-day. We do not ask that the Legislative Council of Kenya, such as it is, should be composed of elements giving to the Indians proportionate representation, either considering the number of the population or considering the amount of taxation that they have to pay towards the general support of the Colony. We are content that we should be less than a half in the Legislature, and so far as the Executive Government is concerned, no more than a bare admission of the Indian element has been conceded. If I may be permitted to say so, nothing more has yet arisen in the shape of a definite demand of our people. It is then, Sir, considered on the merits of the question, a partial, a very partial fulfilment of the rights of equality that is being asked for. As to the franchise, we have expressly agreed that such a qualification should be fixed as will enfranchise only 10 per cent. of the resident Indians. Now, upon what ground is even this modest demand for a partial fulfilment of equality, where the full assertion of equality would

have been eminently justified, resisted? Sir, I think it is best in answering the question to go to the root of the matter at once and without hesitation. The root of the matter I had personal opportunity of understanding. Last year, there were in London certain representatives of the White Kenya community, come to press their views on the authorities, and I was privileged to be present at a private discussion in which their claims were put forward. I may at once state that their claims were clear and were firm. East Africa, Sir, and the Colony of Kenya with which we are particularly concerned, is unfortunately dominated by the spirit of South Africa. It is that spirit that reigns there. The spirit of South Africa, to those who have understood it, is to be summed up in two expressions. The first is "no admission of equality for Indians"; the second is "the expulsion of Indians if possible." There is no mistake about that. I heard these things myself, and the residents who came there told us that it was their desire as early as possible to get into the Union of South Africa as an African Empire, so that Kenya is now to be prepared in its treatment of the Indian element to enter the future African Confederation. That means clearly that Indians are to be expelled and such as happen to be residents are to be denied in so many words that there would be anything like equality accorded to them. Why, Sir, it was my painful business that day to listen continually to statements of this kind: "We will not allow this

equality which is an academic theory, which is the folly of the Colonial Office, we cannot have it here. Let people come out there and see for themselves." And, in order to enforce this point of view, all things that we have seen usually on such occasions are being enacted.

Sir, it is quite extraordinary that even the facts of history are being denied to support this claim. History is falsified and even the facts that the Indian was on the soil before the white settlers appeared, that he has done a good deal to make the Kenya Colony what it is, are being denied. And on the occasion that I have referred to, I further heard it said that if the Indian has done something, as any human being would have done if he were resident in a place, that thing could have been done for the Kenya Colony if the African native was educated for the purpose, and that it was not necessary, that it was not desirable, that the Indians should be allowed to base their claim on the mere fact that they were there, and that they did something to build up the railway or to carry on the trade. If that was done, it was a mistake and it should be modified at the earliest possible opportunity. The Colonial Office was spoken of in terms of the utmost disrespect and contempt, and everybody can see now in the papers that my unfortunate friend, Major the Right Honourable Ormsby Gore, has come in for a good deal of abuse at the hands of the African Press for the simple reason that he stands up for the dignity, for the

righteousness and for the good name of the British Empire.

With regard to the natives of Africa, Sir, as I have said to the Council already, I will try not to raise feeling. The natives of Africa are, as everybody knows, not quite civilised. They are advancing by leaps and bounds. Great efforts are necessary to pull them up along the line of evolution. But will history answer the question in the affirmative, that when the European exploiter, the European colonist, has gone abroad and come into contact with semi-savage tribes, the contact has been beneficial to the latter invariably? Could it be claimed to the credit of the European nations that they have been careful, that they have been solicitous, to observe scrupulously the rights and serve the needs of a semi-barbarous population? Assuming, however, that here and there such a statement could be made with an approximation to the truth, we are in a position to say from information that comes over that the European settlers in East Africa can by no means claim to come under this humane description. Well, Sir, innumerable instances could be quoted to show that their treatment of the East African native is by no means marked by a consideration of common humanity. I will only read one or two extracts to show the spirit in which the thing is done.

The Hon'ble Mr. B. N. Sarma: May I suggest, Sir, that we are dealing now with the question of Indians in East Africa, and having regard to

the state of feeling it might be desirable not to dwell too long upon the question of British *versus* natives of East Africa?

The Hon'ble the Chairman: The Honourable Member has not yet done so. His extract, when he reads it, will show us what he means. I will allow the Honourable Member to proceed.

The Right Hon'ble V. S. Srinivasa Sastri: Sir, I was only saying that as regards the East African native of the soil, it is not the Indian but the white settler from whom he has to be protected. It is that point which I was trying to labour as it is being exploited in England that the introduction of the Indian and his maintenance in full rights of citizenship would be injurious to the development of the East African native. Our whole point is that in so far as that humane object is concerned, we are far more useful in East Africa than the white settlers. I will only read one extract, Sir. It is a quotation from a paper which was addressed to the Head of the Government in East Africa by the Indian residents:—

“Again a party consisting of members of the same school of thought, including amongst them a prominent member of the present Reform Party, assembled in front of the Nairobi Court House, and in the presence of the Magistrate and Police Officer, and in the teeth of the remonstrances from the former and checking by the latter, they publicly flogged certain innocent natives on the plea that it was

useless to take them to court to be dealt with according to the law, etc. etc."

I only mention this to show that Indians could not have done such a thing; but the white settlers in Kenya seem to have a notion of ordered life in a community very different to ourselves. On another occasion it would appear that they did something which was most extraordinary. A number of Europeans, including some prominent members of the present Reform Party, marched up in an unlawful assembly to Government House, insulted Sir James Hasler, the then representative of His Majesty's Government, threw stones at Government House, shouted to Sir James to resign his office, and behaved themselves in such a rebellious manner, simply because the then Governor disagreed with them in their views and policies of forced labour. I do not wish to contemplate what would happen if a number of people came to the Imperial Secretariat in Delhi and behaved in the same manner. His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief would have something to say to that.

Now it is a fact that the white settlers of Kenya have been, through the weakness of that Government, led to believe that they can deal shortly and summarily even with their Government, and when they threaten violence in case equality is forced upon them, they are not bluffing by any means. When the Honourable Member in charge of this subject spoke in another place he seemed to regard these

assertions as mere threats which were never intended to be carried into effect. I thought at the time that he was much too optimistic, and I hope the news that has since come over has made him also change his opinion somewhat. Sir, I can only say that our people, whether in India or abroad, have shown such humility, such respect for order, such patience under the greatest provocation, and such forbearance and modesty in their demands for perfectly established rights, that what an American lady told me recently is perfectly true, that we Indians are about the only Christians left now, omitting the Chinese, on the face of the earth.

Honourable Members will notice that there is a third clause in my Resolution. I wish to say a few words on that subject. The third clause protests against restriction on Indian immigration which it is the intention, it would appear, of the Colonial Office, to enact for the first time. In the other place, when this matter was discussed recently, this matter was not brought to the attention of the authorities in the same way. But immigration and the control of immigration in respect of Kenya Colony are so important that I ask your leave, Sir, and the leave of the Council while I keep them for a few minutes on this subject.

It has been admitted, and admitted on authority that is no longer questionable, that India is an equal partner in the British Empire with Great Britain and with the Dominions. It is a proposition with an

enormous variety of implications. I do not believe that the Indian people will ever take advantage of that claim and draw out all the implications and insist on each one of them. But on this they will. We are three hundred millions in this country. If eighty millions of people must have an outlet, and if they find enormous outlets vast unoccupied spaces all over the world, and keep them all to themselves and coop up the three hundred millions within the limits of India and say to them: "You have no outlet, but you are equal partners in the Empire nevertheless"—that is a proposition to which it is very hard for us to assent. I can understand, although I cannot approve, its being said that other parts of the Empire with vast unpeopled spaces were not conquered by Indians, were not settled by Indians. Perhaps it is a sort of answer; I will not pause to examine it; but the case of East Africa, the case of Kenya Colony is clean. There can be no gainsaying that it cannot be called a British colony and it cannot be allowed to become a British colony. If anything, it is a British Indian colony. Indians have somewhat prior rights, but because they are politically weak and cannot assert their rights in full, they are quite willing to share their rights equally with the British people. It ought to be considered a British Indian colony and we cannot therefore allow the Right Honourable Winston Churchill's assertion that Kenya must be kept a characteristically British colony. Moreover, look at the irony of the situation. Quite recently a sum of

£. 10,000 has been taken from the public revenues of Kenya Colony to which Indians contribute, I understand, somewhat over 50 per cent., and set apart for the establishment of a Publicity Bureau in London with the object of attracting English settlers to that colony. At that very time and while public money to which Indians contribute is freely used for the purpose of attracting white settlers, it is proposed—what an irony of things! to enact restrictions as to Indian immigration which will have the effect of excluding Indians altogether from Kenya. It is impossible for a self-respecting people to submit to such bare-faced violation of the fundamental equities of the case. We are afraid that under pressure it is quite possible that the Colonial Office may yield. Sir, speaking on this occasion, I will, as I have done very frequently before, acknowledge on the part of the Indian public with the fullest appreciation and gratitude the way in which the Government of India and the Secretary of State for India have throughout championed our cause in this matter. We only beg them to keep the fight up a little while longer. If we lose in Kenya the result is we lose all along the line. The Dominions, where I received such hospitality and such sympathetic hearing when I presented our case, the Dominions will be perfectly justified, when a successor of mine goes round hereafter, in turning on him and saying, “What is the case in the Crown Colonies which are administered by the British Cabinet themselves? How can the

British Cabinet solemnly pass a resolution and send you out to seek fulfilment thereof, while its spirit is being violated by the British Cabinet themselves? " Losing in Kenya, we lose therefore in the Self-Governing Dominions, we lose all round, and its moral reaction on the progress of India itself towards the status of a Dominion need not be described in detail. Sir, we cannot afford to lose there. There will be very few friends left in India to plead for the cause of the British Empire. You will wipe out the friends of Britain in India by any such settlement. Britain herself in the eyes of the world will be generally condemned as having fallen a victim to moral decay. For, after this war and the amount of brotherhood that really came up amongst the nations after the League of Nations, and solemn pledges on the part of the British Empire that they are only a lesser League of Nations within the larger League of Nations, the world will be quite justified in passing upon the British Empire the judgment that it has become subject to moral decay, and moral decay cannot long precede material decay. I will say nothing more, Sir, but commend the Resolution to the acceptance of the Council.

The Administration of Kenya.

The following summary of an address given by The Right Hon'ble Srinivasa Sastri at Whitefield's to a Men's Meeting on 27th May appeared in the "Christian Outlook" :—

WE Indians in Kenya ask for a fair field and no favour. We ask for that equity and brotherhood and loving co-operation which it is meet that the sons of men should extend to each other all over the globe wherever they are thrown together. We Indians are quite prepared to consider this problem solely from the point of view of the three million natives of Kenya. If the authorities of Great Britain decide that they will have no other end in view than the uplift of the native population of Kenya, from us they may be sure of the most hearty and cheerful co-operation.

NO DOMINATION DESIRED

But we are accused of a deliberate desire to dominate the African Continent, of a desire to add Kenya, and, if possible, Uganda and Tanganyika to the Indian Empire! The charge appears to me to be almost too ridiculous to answer. When in our history have we desired to obtain possessions outside India? We are scarcely masters of our own destiny

in our own country. Is it possible for serious-minded Indian statesmen, occupied every minute of their lives in removing the humiliation under which they live in their own country, to entertain the idea of annexing a territory in a far-off continent ?

Now there comes along, I am grieved to think, the Christian missionary in Kenya. I wish to talk of him with the greatest respect. He has done great things for us in India. We love him and honour him and welcome him for his beneficent activities. But now for the first time the Christian missionary says to an astonished world : ' We want to keep Kenya free from the attempts of the Indian to introduce his civilisation and his religion.' But who ever heard of a Hindu as a proselytiser ? Has he ever gone out to other lands to make converts ? The Mohammedan has done so occasionally. But you who believe in Christianity, who believe in the consolation of Christianity, who send your missionaries out into the wilds and fastnesses of the earth, amidst unexampled dangers, to present Christ, believing that to present Him is to make Him loved and accepted ; you who ask in every country for an open door, is it you, I ask, that should, on the soil of Kenya, seeking for a field for your labours, first want the country emptied of all other religious faiths ?

Now as regards this alleged desire on our part to establish our own civilisation in Kenya, while our history promptly contradicts any such desire, I am further inclined to say at once that in our present

demand we do not seek domination at all. We have been in Kenya for about 300 or 400 years. Long before the British ever came there, we had established our connections, and built up our businesses. In fact, the Britisher came there in order to protect our interests, and it was because of your influence with the secular powers already established in these parts that the Britisher established a Protectorate, and then converted it into a Crown Colony. It was all for our benefit in the first instance. And now having come there for our benefit, the representatives of the British power say to us, 'You clear out!'

INDIANS DENIED CITIZEN RIGHTS

While I will readily acknowledge a hundred benefits the British Empire has conferred on India, outside India our belonging to the British Empire has brought us only humiliation and tribulation at every step. If we had been outside the British Empire we should have been able to negotiate for ourselves with the powers that ill-treated us, and perhaps found in Great Britain the champion of oppressed nationalities; but while we are under the Union Jack it is a different matter. The Greek, the Italian—and perhaps to-morrow, when things are auspicious, the German and the Austrian—are all welcome alike, because of their white skin, but we British citizens, who have fought alongside the Britisher and have given freely of our lives and of our money in defence of the liberties of the world in general, are told that our skin is of a somewhat different complexion, and that

our civilisation is inferior, and therefore that privileges which the British Government will freely give to the white nations will be denied to us. It has been so in South Africa. It is so to-day in Kenya. In the Self-Governing dominions of the British Empire Indians are treated as aliens, or worse than aliens.

MORAL BANKRUPTCY.

Now this starts in the Indian mind a train of reflection. During the talks I have had with responsible people during the last few weeks, I have been amazed at the sense of moral bankruptcy of the British Empire, that seems to have seized certain sections of politicians. What do they say? 'We do not know why, but we cannot attract the love of alien people. It seems beyond us. We are only a white Empire, and we mean to remain white. We cannot assimilate other peoples. We are trying to give India self-government; in the course perhaps, of a few decades she will become a Self-Governing Dominion, and then what will happen?' I call people who talk like that political atheists. They can have no faith whatever in their own politics or in the ideals of their own Empire.

They say that 'India will go out of the Empire.' But why should we? How benefits India by going out of the Empire? If she is treated equitably, her spiritual and geographical connections with China or with Japan will never occur to her; they have not occurred to her yet. But they may. If British states-

men forget all their own highest ideals, and nobler principles, and their high, God-given mission on earth, if they will continually talk of a white Empire, an English speaking Empire, or the conflict between white and coloured peoples, between East and West ; if Great Britain will abandon her high purpose, and tell her Eastern subjects, 'We have never treated you as our equals, and we will not,' then what can the Indian people do ?

GOD'S PURPOSE FOR BRITAIN AND INDIA

I belong to a Society whose fundamental postulate is that the connection of Great Britain and India is meant for high purposes, under God ; that some of those purposes have been achieved, but that there are larger purposes still that have not yet unfolded to the gaze of men, but which the British Commonwealth may, if it will not turn back with craven spirit upon its destiny, still unfold for the continual benefit of the humankind. I have always held that what is apparently beyond the American Republic, the solution of the coloured problem, is going to be one of the greatest achievements of this British Commonwealth. I have long felt that the genius of British statesmanship—long accustomed not only to tolerate but to understand, and within limits assimilate, the spirit of alien civilisations and alien cultures—will effect a conciliation of different cultures and different civilisations.

Immediately after the Great War, several declarations were made to us of absolute equality, of

honourable and equal citizenship within the British Empire, of every opportunity being afforded us of proving our fitness for Western representative institutions; and in 1921, at the Imperial Conference, under the authority and seal of the Dominion ministers (South Africa excluded), and of important representatives of the British Cabinet, a resolution was put on record the spirit of which was that India, having now been admitted as equal partner, should no longer be subjected to any disability, but should be given the full and unrestricted rights of British citizenship. Is that to be fulfilled in the spirit, or is it, under pressure of the 10,000 white settlers in Kenya, to be repudiated as an impossible ideal?

AN APPEAL FOR JUSTICE

We do not wish to dominate. We do not wish to impose our civilisation. We do not wish to deprive the African native of his rights and his liberties. We want to remain where we are in Kenya: where we were before the Britisher came; and we want to see British justice meted out to *all* her citizens.

Speech at the Queen's Hall Meeting

[The following is a summary of the speech delivered by The Rt. Hon. Sastri at the great meeting held in the Queen's Hall, London, on the 26th June, 1923, to express sympathy with India, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald presiding :—

THE question, " Shall Britain and India walk together ? " is rather a sharp one. Speaking for the Indians, I can say that nine-tenths of us would refuse to think of Britain and India severing their alliance. For myself, I know of no greater calamity than if my country should make up her mind that she has no self-respecting place within this great and beneficent organisation of our Commonwealth.

There are two ideals of this great Commonwealth. One of complete equality and brotherhood amongst the various component parts, with mutual trust and respect, that each contributes to the Commonwealth according to its capacity and tradition, for humanity as a whole. The other ideal is that the general privileges and profits are largely to belong to the white population, and that these great advantages should be shared with other populations to a very limited extent. If you wish to maintain this Commonwealth at its level of efficiency and advantage to the world at large you must drop this second

ideal, and adopt without reservation of qualification the first. (Applause.) South Africa was given Dominion status some years ago with great prestige to the Empire. But in the Constitution of parts of the Union of South Africa, an article of the fundamental law lays it down in so many words that there shall be no equality between white and coloured in Church or State. The existence of an article of that kind in certain self-governing parts of the Commonwealth, you will at once see, is a force that will make for disunion and disruption rather than for consolidation. (Applause.) We are, therefore, all alike interested in finding its root, rigidly localising the trouble, and applying all possible remedies. I rather fear this poison has recently shown a tendency to spread, and that tendency fills me, as it must fill every friend of the Commonwealth, with alarm. I am grieved to think that while this attitude is an attribute generally of the Boer population, it sometimes has a tendency to affect even the larger manhood and higher principles of the British people, when they go to dwell in those regions. Your great Empire-builder, Cecil Rhodes, left an exactly opposite principle to operate, and that was equal privileges for all civilised men. (Applause.) Colour or creed or race was not to interfere, but if a man was civilised he had the same rights as every other citizen. Unfortunately, the whole Union of South Africa is marked by a tendency to create a difference between coloured and white, and Kenya is another sphere where it is

beginning to manifest itself. Can we view with equanimity a state of things in which the whole of Africa, so far as it is part of the British Commonwealth, should become a theatre within which white populations will be contending with other populations for the maintenance of privilege and monopoly, which we have resolved for the benefit of humanity to banish from other parts of our Commonwealth? (Applause.) It is specially unfortunate that the white population in Kenya have asked for support from South Africa, and General Smuts has apparently promised that, when the time arrives, he will interfere on their behalf. It will be nothing short of a disaster for the Commonwealth if General Smuts permits himself to interpose in this matter. Is he, when ideas of equality and brotherhood are gaining ascendancy in the British Commonwealth, to come in and put things wrong again? (No.) I shall regard it as an abdication and a complete surrender on the part of the Imperial Cabinet here if it permits the head of the South African Government to dictate to it what its policy should be in the conduct of this the chosen instrument in the hands of Providence for the redemption of mankind.

One other point. People bid us "Be patient." We are a very ancient people, and trace our existence long, long before the time when Europe became a civilised continent. (Applause.) Have you won your famous rights and privileges, your immunities, by the exercise of patience? Are our white friends in Kenya

now giving us a model of patience? Even the patient peoples of the East seem at last to be learning a lesson or two from you. I much regret it: our patience and moderation have been our shield in the past. Non-Co-operation in India, a comparatively mild weapon, although it had the backing of Mahatma Gandhi, a man of unexampled purity of life, did not have the wholehearted support of our countrymen. Our faith in the virtue of constitutional agitation is still unshaken. We still believe that by the adoption of exclusively peaceful methods, we shall achieve Dominion Status and equality abroad, and hand down to the world an example of which the British Commonwealth may be proud. Will you not strengthen every element that makes for peace, that encourages the growth of bodies like the League of Nations, which seeks to compose differences between Nations and communities, by discussion, by compromise and settlement, and not by the arbitrament of war? Upon the way in which you treat the demands of Indians, whether in Kenya or South Africa or India—whether you call upon them to put forward force and violence or whether you welcome their demands and meet them, as you should, with high-souled generosity—upon that depends whether you help forward the ideals of the League of Nations and prevent a future war, upon that depends whether you build this British Commonwealth of yours upon the largest foundation of justice. (Applause.)

Speech at the Hotel Cecil.

The following speech was delivered by The Rt. Hon. Sastri at the Hotel Cecil in London at a reception accorded him by Sir Ali Imam on 2nd August, 1923 :—

SIR Ali Imam, Your Highness, Ladies and Gentlemen. I am indeed extremely grateful to our host and hostess for this opportunity of meeting friends before I depart from these shores. As a homage to the great importance of the subject of the Kenya decision, I have departed from my usual practice and set down some thoughts on paper, with the full intention that I should speak with perfect candour as befits this great occasion.

The Indian Delegations from Kenya and from India have, without hesitation, rejected the settlement announced the other day by the Cabinet and approved by Parliament. News from India and from Kenya clearly indicates that the vast bulk of the community resent the settlement with an especial bitterness.

It is noteworthy that Anglo-Indians and Britishers here who had avowed genuine sympathy with Indian feeling, are disposed to think that, however unsatisfactory the settlement may be in certain respects, Indians had better acquiesce in it for the time

being, and seek a betterment when a more propitious condition of things should have been established.

It looks like inconsiderateness and ingratitude not to profit by the experienced counsel of comrades, and I, who have received evidence of friendship in an unbounded measure, feel under an especial obligation to explain fully and candidly why I consider acquiescence in the settlement, on our part, impossible.

There is one gain of immense significance upon which all parties to the dispute, as well as the Imperial Cabinet, may congratulate themselves. It is the clear and unequivocal recognition that the interests of the African native are paramount, and must take precedence of those of the immigrant communities. The Colonial Office have in express terms declared themselves to be trustees, and it is to be hoped, will take their trust more seriously and conscientiously than they have done heretofore. (Laughter.) Missionary and Humanitarian Agencies cannot afford to relax their vigilance in the slightest degree, nor suppose that the new Government of Kenya, or the representatives of Christianity there, will prove efficient guardians of the indigenous population from a menace that has neither been discouraged nor weakened. However, in spite of this trusteeship which, according to the Colonial Office, they have always held, the position of the white settlers has not been constitutionally altered, while their prestige has been enhanced by the undoubted triumph of their recent agitation. The Cabinet will yet rue the day when

they shrank from the only step which would have effectuated their trusteeship, namely, the disfranchisement of the white community and reversion to pure Crown Colony administration. Neither the Governor nor his official majority can be expected to shake off the domination to which in the past they have so abjectly surrendered, to the detriment of the unfortunate native, as well as of the other coloured communities.

A word will be in place at this point as to the contention that the white settlers have sustained a loss under the head of responsible government. Now no competent authority had promised them anything like self-government. Mr. Churchill's statement, often quoted in this connection, in no more than a pious personal wish, and could not have furnished occasion even for a legitimate hope.

The abandonment of a mere dream can by no means be described as a loss in political campaigning. On the other hand, look at the facts. The white settlers are still to have an Adult Franchise, in this respect being in advance of nearly every other part of the Empire, and their continued representation in the Legislative Council by eleven elected members leaves them undisturbed, whether as to absolute numerical strength or as to the possession of a clear majority even in the non-official part of the Council. Even the smaller expedient of withdrawing native affairs from the scope of the Legislature has been negatived, and Lord Delamere has sought, by a remark-

able exercise of ingenuity, to debar the five Indian representatives, if they should ever sit on the Council, from meddling with native affairs, on the ground that the trusteeship is exclusively British. Where, then, are we to find any guarantee in the new Constitution for the protection of the native which there was not before, or for the more moderate and equitable exercise of political power by a strongly entrenched, self-assertive oligarchy, backed by the sympathy and support of the official majority?

Let me now assess the gains and losses of my own community. One gain only is clear, though even that is subject to qualification—the rejection of all proposals for residential and commercial segregation. The latter, *i.e.*, commercial segregation, has been abandoned as impracticable, while the former is to be secured by building and sanitary regulations, and not by the offensive method of racial discrimination. Segregation, however, in respect of the Highlands is to be perpetuated, and segregation is to be introduced, although not in a physical sense, in the political and municipal franchise of the Colony. The Wood-Winterton Agreement had fixed a proportion of 10 per cent. of the Indian community for enfranchisement—the White Paper appears to favour the idea of an even higher percentage on the apparent ground that it does not matter how many are brought on the register so long as the register is confined to Indians. If anyone thinks that a concession made on that obvious ground is likely to please or be valued, he

does not know human nature. To compensate those who are excluded from the Highlands, it is proposed to constitute, under limitations, an Indian reserve in the Lowlands. The Indian community looks upon this offer as a trap which must be avoided and a bribe which must be rejected. They object to exclusion, whether it is of the Indian from the Highlands or of the white man from the Lowlands. If they ask for equality, it is for equality of privilege, and not for equality in disability. If then, they escape from the ignominy of physical segregation, it is the only gain which can at all merit that description.

And what are the losses? Exclusion from the Highlands has just been mentioned. Hitherto, resting under the approval of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, this discrimination, involving barefaced partiality, is invested, henceforth with the sanction of H. M. Government and the Imperial Parliament. Nor is this the only colour bar that has been erected. The new franchise penalises colour in three different ways. First of all, it segregates coloured from white communities. It passes one's comprehension how the Cabinet can make themselves responsible for a statement so clearly opposed to the truth as this on page 12 :—

"No justification is seen for the suggestion that it is derogatory to any of the communities so represented."

Surely Communal Representation on the Legislature has been demanded in Kenya, solely on the ground that the white is superior to the coloured

person, irrespective of individual qualifications. Communal franchises in India exist, but for different reasons; not that I would justify them even for those reasons, but it is only just to point out that they have nothing to do with the galling suggestion of inferiority on racial or coloured grounds. The reasoning of the White Paper would almost appear to indicate that the Communal System was good even for Great Britain, but however that be, the following statement is utterly gratuitous and borders on hypocrisy:—

“From the point of view of the Indian residents themselves”—how they appreciate our views!—“this system permits of a far wider franchise being given than would be the case if a common electoral roll were introduced, and this alone renders it acceptable to all supporters of the Indian claims who have at heart the political development of the Indian people.”

They might have asked us whether our view corresponds to this statement. (Laughter.)

Here again, a reference must be made to the unfortunate Wood-Winterton Agreement, which the India Office have apparently swallowed, which would have established a common electoral roll with the qualifications applicable to all communities alike. The communal system renders it possible to establish another great disparity between the communities, so in Kenya we shall find an adult franchise for the white citizen and a suffrage limited by qualifications for the Indian citizen. And apparently, also suffrage on different qualifications for the Arab citizen, and when the time becomes ripe, for the native citizen. But the citizenship of the Indian is a third decisive humi-

liation. Though he greatly outnumbers the white citizen and, though he is no less important, makes no less contribution to the resources of the State, he is to return only five members to the Legislature, against eleven allotted to the favoured community. On the one hand, eleven is a clear majority of the non-official portion of the Council, and five, it is no great piece of arithmetic to know, is less than half of that. No more contemptuous negative could be given in answer to India's claim of equality.

Next, as to immigration: the subtle cynicism of the White Paper is most perceptible under this heading. The theory propounded is in favour of the Indian, the practice prescribed is all to the benefit of the white. Starting off with a courageous declaration that racial discrimination in immigration regulations, whether specific or implied, would not be in accord with the general policy of H. M. Government, the document proceeds to record two findings:—

1. That it is immediately necessary to restrict the immigration of those from whom the African native stands in risk of economic competition.
2. That these undesirable economic competitors are small traders, subordinate clerks in Government and private employ, and mechanical labourers.

Now it is a well-known fact that these three professions are exactly those which are followed by Indians in Kenya. Does it merely happen? Is it a simple accident?

We know two facts just previous to the arrival of the various deputations in London. When the terms of the Wood-Winterton Agreement were made

known to the white population in Kenya, they refused even to look at the document, unless Indian immigration were forthwith restricted, with a view to eventual stoppage. The Colonial Minister, changing his mind as to the necessity of immigration, sent for the Governor of Kenya, attended by representative white settlers. What was demanded was restrictions openly directed against Indians. What is given is restrictions directed against the occupations, for which Indians go to Kenya. Shall I be called perverse if I say that our case is lost, even on the immigration question? We cited facts and figures to prove that, taking the last twelve years into account, the European community has increased much faster than the Indian. We cited facts and figures to prove that during the last two years more Indians have left the Colony than have gone into it. We pleaded that, instead of being competitors, at present we were the only people who trained and taught the native anything. We pleaded that when the competition stage was reached the native would, in the ordinary course of things, defeat us on his own ground. We pleaded that the Government had no data as to the extent of the competition, or as to the numbers of the various communities or professions that the Colony could absorb. We pleaded that it would be unjust without an open enquiry to conclude on the prejudiced and one-sided statement of white settlers, or even of missionaries, that our presence was a menace to the development of the native. The facts

and figures and pleas have all been set aside, and we have been condemned. To add a touch of sarcasm to the whole thing, we are bidden to congratulate ourselves that we are not excluded on racial, but on economic grounds. (Applause.)

Which is the greater menace to the welfare and the progress of the African native? Is it the small trader or the artisan who can be squeezed out by the ordinary laws of competition, or is it the farmer, who grabs land on a large scale, and squats permanently and fortifies himself by every means that the law will allow? Does any one seriously believe that the white man, once established in political ascendancy over the semi-civilized, will ever help him along the path of political evolution and in the end gladly surrender responsible government into his hands? Does the experience of Ireland, Egypt, or India justify such a forecast? The white man's mission to rule, to domineer, to annex, is blazoned forth on every page of history—(applause)—and yet this Cabinet of Great Britain, newly awakened to their obligations as trustees of the native, would let white immigration flow unchecked into Kenya. They have not been impressed at all by the fact that the Indian has long emigrated into East Africa, that he has been excluded from the self-governing Dominions, and that to exclude him from the Colonies on racial or economic grounds is to deny him the benefits of British citizenship and, in fact, to deprive it of all value to him.

Towards the end of the White Paper the Cabinet profess to apply the principle enunciated in the resolutions of the Imperial Conference of 1921 to the peculiar conditions of a tropical colony in British East Africa. Those jaw-breaking expressions of proper names are meant to terrify you with the extraordinary difficulty of conditions in Kenya. In fact, the expression they use is to relate the principle of the Conference to the conditions of Kenya. "To relate"—well, this relation is achieved by the institution of a colour bar, and by the relegation of Indians to an inferior position and a debased citizenship.

How short is human memory! It is not so long ago that no words were good enough for the Indian for his services during the War, his loyalty, his bravery on the battlefield, and the rich compensations he had earned. Where are the pledges gone, and the full rights of citizenship and absolute equality and ungrudged partnership in the Empire? They came from Royalty, from responsible Ministers, from the Press and from the platform, with every grade of solemnity and in every tone of sonorous phrasing. Why cite the resolution of the Imperial Conference of 1921, with its demurrer from South Africa and India's answer thereto? That resolution applied only to the self-governing Dominions, with which India had in the year 1918 entered into a pact of reciprocity. H. M. Government controlling the Crown Colonies directly came under the sway of principles of

Equality and Brotherhood long anterior to 1918, and pledges and promises of quite respectable antiquity.

After waiting for a long time with his proverbial patience, and after earning equal treatment a hundred times over, and after endless expostulations and entreaties, and having declared that Kenya supplied the acid test of Empire and his position in the Empire, the Indian has been cruelly betrayed. The victim of many broken pledges, the dupe of many solemn promises, his faith in the character for justice and impartiality of the British Empire seemed almost incurable. He is at last undeceived.

He now realises that a large section of the British people, the section that keeps the present Government in power, have not come under the sway of the spirit and ideals of the League of Nations, and that in their opinion pledges made to a people not able to exact their fulfilment need only to be honoured to the extent that it may be convenient or profitable. The deciding factor of the decision is not to be found in the White Paper at all, make no mistake about that. It is something outside of it altogether. As Colonel Wedgwood said the other day, it is the fact that the whites in Kenya threatened force, while the Indians relied on the merits of their case. Not justice or truth, but the amount of trouble that a party is able to cause prevails with His Majesty's Government to-day. (Applause.) Having had this lesson burnt into them, Indians, let us hope, will not ever forget it again. (Cheers.)

In making war on the Republic of South Africa, Great Britain professed to teach President Kruger exalted and righteous principles of Government. President Kruger is now fully avenged. Not only are Indians worse treated under the Union Jack than ever before, but the colour bar of South Africa is spreading over the British Empire, and it is now infected with the poison of the Boer spirit. The undertaking to establish justice and righteousness in the Empire, which the Labour Party gave through Colonel Wedgwood, the untamed champion of good causes, however weak, is the one bright feature of an otherwise gloomy situation. We owe them a deep debt of gratitude. (Applause.)

One final word. Our friends must understand that in the whole of this struggle India has looked in vain for one sign, one gesture that Britain recognises her right to equality, or, as Sir Robert Hamilton, in a wise and temperate speech, said, that they will have the citizenship of the British Empire. Is there one matter in respect of the Highlands, the franchise or immigration restrictions wherein that aspiration and sentiment are satisfied? The denial of it is written large on the pages of the White Paper.

How can India acquiesce in this settlement for one moment? It blasts at once the hope of India and the honour of Britain.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I have expressed myself, as I told you before, with fulness and candour on the question as it appears before us. What we

'are to do in the future is the question, I am sure, that is oppressing young hearts here, as it is oppressing young hearts in India. (Applause.) In short interviews I have given indications of my personal views, but they are only personal views. It is difficult to take decisions when one is far away from friends. Anxious thought, mature deliberation, are necessary before plans can be laid. Wait yet awhile in patience. I will not, therefore, at this moment say what will be done in India. But I will say this once more, which I have said before, I will allow myself to say this, that India has lost many a time because she has never shown that she can resent indignities in the only way in which a strong Western Power understands resentment. (Cheers.)

Kenya as a Crown Colony.

The following article outlining a form of government for Kenya, appeared in the August number of the "Outward Bound":—

THE goal of British administration in that part of the world is now recognised on all hands to be the preparation of the African native to govern himself and take his destinies into his own hands. This had, apparently, been dimly perceived before; perhaps the Colonial Office would claim that it had not only perceived it but kept it more or less in view in its conduct of Kenya affairs. This claim, however, cannot be allowed because an adult franchise has been conferred on the white inhabitants, who allege, further, that hope has been held out to them of complete Responsible Government in the future. The official majority in the Legislative Council enables the Crown to impose its will on the administration, but in practice this majority has always acted in conformity with the wishes of the dominant race, who have thus been allowed to consider themselves as the exclusive masters of the soil and the custodians of the welfare of the population. They have even claimed that they are the chosen trustees of the African natives and refuse to share this great responsibility with any other community. Anyhow, the future course is clear.

Steps must be taken to ensure that the virtual, and not merely legal, control of policy and measures is exercised from Whitehall. For it is here that one can find the best guarantee that the great ideals of the Commonwealth, as well as the experiences of local administration will be remembered. A pure Crown Colony type of Government, then, must be set up in Kenya. A Legislature with a certain number of members, nominated by the Government to represent the various interests, would doubtless be a valuable adjunct to the authorities on the spot, but the present constitution which includes a strong and assertive minority of white colonists, is certainly not compatible with free exercise of final control from the seat of Empire. A body of members elected by free constituencies have a tendency, which is almost invincible, to grasp at the reality of power, and cannot fail to exercise intimate influence on all the details of administration. It is true there are, in the varied Empire, many spots in which communities enjoy limited opportunities of giving constitutional advice to the authorities. Such arrangements, however, are generally transitional, and, except as stages to Responsible Government, have no decreed value in themselves. By common consent Kenya is not to have any form of Responsible Government till the native can be said "to have come into his own." Why then, embarrass ourselves with the forms of a regular Constitution, which can only obscure the seat of ultimate responsibility, and create expectations of

growth which cannot be fulfilled? Moreover, the existence of franchise for one section of the community—not the most numerous, although of great importance—necessarily leads to a demand for a similar franchise by other communities, which it would be impossible to resist. Indians, Arabs, and even natives of Kenya, who possess the prescribed qualifications, must in fairness be admitted to the full rights of citizenship. In view of these considerations, it is to be hoped that the Imperial Cabinet will have the wisdom and summon the courage to withdraw the franchise now enjoyed by the white community in Kenya. For a wonder this franchise goes further than the franchise of Great Britain or the franchise of South Africa, to which the White Community so often looks for inspiration. It has only been in existence since 1919, and no one who studies the recent annals of Kenya will assert that the political power it carries has been used with moderation or impartiality. It is possible also to quote a few instances, like that of Jamaica, where a white community has surrendered the franchise which had been granted. After all, the feelings of a small number of immigrants must not be allowed to stand in the way of an arrangement obviously necessary to the paramount interest of the indigenous population. The spokesmen of the Indian community have unhesitatingly given their consent to the reversion to Crown Colony administration. Whatever their interests or self-esteem may seem to require,

they have too much sympathy for backward communities not to put them aside. Indians, too, will hail with joy the deliberate adoption, almost for the first time, by an aggressive Western power, of a policy which sets trusteeship above exploitation, and may derive some small satisfaction from being instrumental, even though indirectly, in the inauguration of an experiment charged with such promise for the moral regeneration of the human race.

Kenya Deputation's Statement

The following is the text of the statement prepared by the Kenya Deputation under the joint signatures of Mr. Srinivasa Sastri, Mr. B. S. Kamat and Mr. Jamnadas Dwarakadas :—

THE body that deputed us on the Kenya Mission, namely the Central Legislature of India, not being in session, we are glad to avail ourselves of the opportunity considerably and courteously afforded by the Editor of the *Times of India* to submit to the country through its columns a brief statement of our work.

FOUR MAIN HEADS OF THE DISPUTE

The four main heads of dispute between our countrymen and the white settlers of Kenya were (1) segregation, (2) the right of purchase in the Highlands, (3) common franchise and adequate representation in the Legislative Council, and (4) the right of free immigration. Our case succeeded only under the first head. The second and third heads have gone directly against us. The fourth has also gone against us, but indirectly—not on the ground originally apprehended but on a different ground. India's heart yearned for equal citizenship of the Commonwealth, but the settlement gives us a citizenship inferior to that of the white population. The settlement does not.

discuss our claim to equality at all. No reason is given for its denial now, no hope is held out for the future. Our mission, therefore, has met with almost complete failure.

One feature of general satisfaction deserves mention. The interests of the African native are declared paramount and entitled to precedence over those of the immigrant communities. The Colonial Office have asserted, or according to them reasserted, their trusteeship of the native. It involves as a corollary the denial of responsible government for a long time to come to the people of the Colony. Indians are told to rejoice with the natives of Kenya at having escaped subjection to a narrow oligarchy of white settlers. Poor comfort to those that had every right to expect equal citizenship and equal partnership in the Commonwealth.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS FOR HELP

When the deputation arrived in London at the end of April, the propaganda of the other side had gained ground to an alarming extent. The air was full of lying stories of deep-laid plots on the part of Indians to acquire political supremacy in Kenya, to annex the Colony to India and to defraud the natives and whites alike of their just rights. It seemed doubtful that we could produce any impression at all. Friends and champions, however, came forth and gave valiant help. In the ranks of the press, we should make grateful mention of the *Daily News*, the *Daily Herald*, the *Manchester*

Guardian, the *Observer* and the *Nation*. Associations got up meetings in furtherance of our cause, like the Anti-Slavery Society, to give but one instance. Opportunities were given us to address small groups of members of Parliament. We lie under special obligations to the Theosophical Society in London, and to the British Auxiliary of the National Conference in Delhi, for arranging the great Queen's Hall demonstration and a number of gatherings in various towns, as well as for continuous and unremitting attention to the cause of India. The social position, personal influence, and untiring industry of the Lady Emily Lutyens were at our command. Mr. Jinarajadasa brought to our aid moving eloquence and moral fervour. Out of many other individuals who helped, a few must be elected as deserving in a special degree the gratitude of India. It were an impertinence to praise Mr. Andrews. The consecration of his life, his character and his unequalled knowledge of Kenya and kindred problems gave his words an authority that could not be denied; and to his clear-sighted humanity must be given as much credit as to any other single cause for the final acknowledgment of the African natives paramount interest. Mr. Polak, lidless watcher of India's weal in Britain as well as overseas, often criticised but not thanked equally often, was practically in charge of our deputation's activity and never grudged time, energy or money. Our good fortune secured us the sympathy and aid of the Rev. Dr. Oldham, whose lively sense of justice and human brotherhood is

united to rare sagacity and power of persuasion. His Highness the Agha Khan, it needs scarcely be said, throughout guided our counsels and ungrudgingly employed the skill and resourcefulness of a remarkable personality for the cause which during several years he has made his own. No list, however, meagre, of our indebtedness could be complete which did not make prominent mention of the great service rendered by the party which now forms His Majesty's Opposition, in allowing its spokesman in Parliament to promise that, when it comes into power, justice and brotherhood shall be established in the Commonwealth.

COMPLAINT AGAINST COLONIAL OFFICE.

We are constrained to make one adverse remark on the procedure of the Colonial Office. They granted private interviews to us and what were understood to be preliminary interviews to the Kenya deputations, white and Indian. Our countrymen were asked besides to submit a written statement of their case, which they did. A long time was then allowed to elapse. A week before the Colonial vote was to be taken up in the Committee of the House, the Indian deputations were received together by His Grace the Duke of the Devonshire attended by his principal officials. We were told that our representations had been fully considered, that the Colonial Office had embodied their conclusions in recommendations placed before the Cabinet, that these could not be divulged and that we might make any further representations that we wished to make at the stage. We said we

might be able to adduce fresh evidence or make additional statements if we knew the recommendations that His Grace had made to the Cabinet. But he was firm in refusing to take us into his confidence and added that the white deputation would be placed in no better position. After some more futile talk the meeting broke up. We must record our feeling that if we had known of the recommendations even at that late stage we might have shown sufficient reason to change them at least in part. In a statement published in the London Press, after the debate in the Commons, Lord Delamere stated that he and his colleagues had *signed* the settlement in token of their acceptance. The Kenya Indians were not invited to sign anything. We could not make out whether any discrimination was made between the two deputations by the Colonial Office. Some light must be thrown on the matter.

RELATIONS WITH INDIA OFFICE

Lords Peel and Winterton showed us every possible consideration personally. We saw them fairly frequently in the first part of our stay in London. Besides, they enabled us to see other influential persons by arranging luncheon parties for the purpose. These and similar kindnesses and courtesies we desire to acknowledge with the most sincere gratitude. Our discussions of the Kenya question were full in the beginning and marked by much freedom. It would be appropriate in this context to indicate certain important points which arose from these discussions.

I. The India Office urged us at the very start to take a definite stand on the Wood-Winterton agreement. After a little hesitation we adopted the advice, but not before obtaining from the India Office a declaration of their intention not to be shaken. From that time onward, we have on every public and private occasion repeated our adherence to this compromise. The final settlement, however, as any one can see, is a material falling off from the Wood-Winterton agreement under every head except segregation. Yet our champions at the India Office have acquiesced in it, and advise India to do likewise.

Our fellow-countrymen from Kenya have maintained an attitude of disapproval towards this agreement. Still we have good reason to believe that if in the end the Cabinet's decision had coincided in the main with that agreement, they would have come into line with us and accepted it as a working compromise.

II. We pointed out to the India Office that it was wrong to base our claims on the resolution of the Imperial Conference of 1921. That resolution applied only to the self-governing dominions, with which India had entered into a sort of reciprocity.

SUCCESSION OF PLEDGES

It was obvious on a perusal of its terms that in the particular case of Kenya it would negative the claim that India put forward to free emigration. As a matter of fact, the white settlers were not slow to take advantage of this flaw in our reasoning and to

insist that before the second part was applied to their colony, the first part should be applied as well. We followed our own line in advocating India's claims, and as Lord Peel stated in the Upper House, relied rather on the equities of the case and the succession of Britain's pledges.

In fact, our case with regard to Kenya would not have lost in cogency if the 1921 Conference had passed no resolution on the status of Indians abroad. Our readers will note, however, that the White Paper treats the Indians' claim as though it rested solely on the terms of that resolution.

III. Some few weeks after our arrival in London the India Office began to induce us to accept the communal in place of the common franchise. This we firmly refused to do. When reminded of several communities in India being in favour of the communal arrangement, we replied that even those communities would reject it without hesitation if Indians were not granted the same amount of representation in the legislature as the white settlers. The idea of equality was the supreme test, and if it was not to be found in a common franchise, it must be found at least in the amount of representation.

AN OMINOUS DIFFERENCE

IV. An ominous difference made its appearance in the very beginning. The India Office professed a horror of first principles, and urged us to avoid such expressions as equality and equal citizenship. We

argued that it sounded like practical wisdom in a debate on details; but our entire claim was to equality and no actual suggestion could be tested except by reference to that principle. Where it seemed unnecessary we would avoid rhetoric as generalisations but if it came to losing a point by losing sight of the equality idea we should not shrink from enunciating it. Propaganda was impossible without continual appeal to principles. We were unable, therefore, to heed this caution of the India Office. In the propaganda of our adversaries, the head and front of our offending was often stated to be the assertion of a claim to equality, the very audacity of which was sufficient to take away their breath. The public will not fail to notice the fact that throughout the White Paper, the equality test is not applied to any of the Cabinet's decisions. It is for the very good reason that none of these will satisfy it. Did the India Office smell a dismal lack of principle in the coming decision that they were so anxious to disturb our simple faith in the very beginning?

About a week before the White Paper was issued, we were informed, on what seemed good authority but turned out otherwise, that the Cabinet were going to decide in our favour on segregation and immigration, but against us on the highlands question and the franchise. We did not give up hope even then, but sent to Lord Peel on the 20th July for submission to the Cabinet a letter on those two points.

DISAPPOINTMENT AND INDIGNATION

Our disappointment and indignation can be imagined when we read the White Paper. Indians would not be excluded on racial but on economic grounds. The native of Kenya needed to be protected from unequal competition in certain occupations; and just those occupations were named which Indians followed. The Cabinet had nothing to say about those that took away the land and the liberties of the native by force and by diplomatic expedients of a questionable character well-known in the history of the contact of East and West, and of civilised and barbarous communities.

Decisions so palpably one sided and so flagrantly subversive of repeated promises and professions must have a deeper basis than is to be seen in the specious reasoning of the White Paper. The first part thereof purports to give the historical background, but it is utterly misleading on account of two glaring omissions. One of these is the long, close and uninterrupted connection of India with pre-British as well as British Kenya. The other, with which we are concerned here, is the state of preparedness for rebellion in which the white community of Kenya have been for some time. They boasted that British opinion would not tolerate the despatch of forces to Kenya, and that if forces were despatched in defiance of that opinion, they would not act. A notorious parallel from the recent history of Ulster was relied on in support of this hope. On the other side, what was there to fear ?

Discontent amongst certain sections of Indians might be genuine but it was harmless. Hard words never lost an empire. Secession, paralysis of the administration, chronic deadlocks, these have been talked of for some years now. Non-Co-operation ended with the arrest of the leader. The salt-tax agitation could not come off. As for the Liberal Party in Indian politics, did they ever amount to much? Anyhow, they were no longer necessary. This cry of "Wolf" had been overdone. The Viceroy of India could still keep the country quiet if told to do so. In any case there was a safe interval now. Let British interests be consolidated in all possible ways, before Indians learned to cause real trouble.

FUTURE LINES OF ACTIVITY

Sentiments of this tenour were often expressed in certain organs of the British press. We heard them now and then in circles where the secret springs of policy are known. It would be beyond the province of our deputation to suggest the future lines of non-official activity in India or in Kenya. But our report would have been incomplete, indeed it would have been false and misleading, if we had for any reasons whatever, kept from the people of India the real inwardness of the ill-success of our mission.

The Kenya Betrayal

Soon after his return from England Mr. Sastri, whose medical advisers had enjoined on him complete rest for some months from all public activity issued a powerful statement on the Kenya decision. The document Which is printed below gave fitting expression to the feeling of indignation and resentment over the betrayal of Indian interests in Kenya :—

I FEEL it a great misfortune to be put out of action when there is such urgent call for service in the cause of the Motherland. But I have been warned that I must take complete rest if I am to avoid a collapse. Before doing so, I wish to say a few words to the public.

I advocate without hesitation a policy of vigorous action by our country to indicate our genuine feeling to a people who attach no meaning to mere verbal expression of them. I say "country" generally, because it is impossible to expect a Government which is not national, either in spirit or in personnel, and which is compelled to look to Whitehall for orders even in matters of secondary importance, to act for the people and in the name of the people, when despatch-writing and argumentation have come to an end. This proved incapacity

of our Government is a grievous handicap in the maintenance of our just rights as against other communities in this Empire. If we could imagine for a moment that we had our own Government when the Cabinet decision on Kenya was announced, they would have taken instantaneous action with the same instinct with which for example, one's right hand moves to protect from injury any part of one's body. There would be no need of public meetings and protestations, no need of hartals and passionate cries for help. There is no country in the world where, if time were allowed for popular deliberation, or the balancing of good against evil, of material interest against National honour, eminent individuals and even considerable sections of people would not be found to counsel a course of feebleness and resignation. In India it is no wonder that such active feeling of indignation as there is cannot be mobilised for an immediate stroke. It is an inherent weakness of the present stage of our political evolution that a large popular effort should lead to much spectacular display but little calculable result. There is no use trying to transcend this regrettable limitation. The situation would be utterly devoid of hope if we waited till we could act on the highest plane and with shining prospects of success. With cheap cynicism people fling the word "ineffective" at all proposals which cannot bring about the surrender of the British Cabinet and revocation of the settlement of July 24th.

Those who would act within the limitations of their time cannot afford to be answering these everlasting objectors.

Nor would any one seriously claim for the puny efforts proposed the dignified epithet of retaliatory or punitive. How dare we expect to punish the mighty? But there is none so weak, but he can refuse to part with his self-respect voluntarily, no community so fallen but may reject an ignoble association to which it is under no coercion to consent. Why should Imperial authorities deviate from their settled policy if they find that it makes no difference to the outward action, either of the Government or of the people of India, that while the Government is prepared as ever to employ the resources of the country for purposes of Imperial glorification, the representatives of the people continue ready and willing, even on a footing of declared subordination, to participate in the councils of the Empire and to join in schemes of a voluntary or semi-voluntary nature for the common good or ostentation of the dominant communities? A hard-headed and hard-hearted employer would not be impressed by brave resolutions and declarations of rights on behalf of his workmen if he could count on their coming at the stated hours and working under the stated conditions for as long as he chose to employ them. Things would doubtless be different in the case of a right-minded and noble-hearted employer. But it offers no similitude to the present Tory Government of Great Britain.

Some time ago the representatives of two Dominions, displeased at a comparatively trifling arrangement made by the authorities of the British Empire Exhibition, 1924, threatened non-participation and carried their point. That is the way in which serious displeasure shows itself. If our Government could take such a step, no Cabinet would think of treating it as they have treated it in the case of Kenya. Few persons realise in India what great importance is attached to the Exhibition as a display of the resources of the Empire, or what glowing hopes are entertained in the business world of its material benefits. In both directions India's part in the show is imposing. Doubtless the trained exploiters of the world would see that she profited as little as possible in the end. Correspondingly, her withdrawal, if its possibility could be conceived, would be felt as in the nature of a blow at the Empire. Tremendous efforts must be made by influential local committees to keep back private exhibitors and semi-official agencies, while the Government and statutory bodies like Improvements Trusts must be reached by the usual channels of public opinion until the new Legislatures could take the constitutional action open to them.

Nobody supposes that the withdrawal of the unofficial representatives of India from the Imperial Conference will reduce it to a state of impotence or paralysis. Those, however, who value self-respect and study its manifestations in human affairs will

look for certain "prompt reactions," to use an American expression, when it is infringed. It is not easy any longer to persuade the average British politician that amongst our intelligentsia and their representatives in high circles, feelings of resentment and indignation are of the same kind as in the rest of the world. Dominion as well as British statesmen may think our indignation misplaced and profess unconcern at our absence. But they cannot help being conscious, in contemplating our vacant places, that affronted human nature had found becoming expression. Again, who will pretend that the measures of retaliation recommended to our future Legislatures will inflict injury on the offending communities at all adequate to the injury that we have received? Nevertheless, such action as we can take is fully expected and cannot be avoided except at the risk of worse indignities and insults. I well remember being told in 1921: "If we hit you, why don't you hit us in return? We have accorded you full power of reciprocity." Where one is in the grip of a big bully, patient and philosophic submission is no remedy. To hit out with all one's strength may not be effective either, but it is at least a vindication of one's manhood. The poet has said that the imprisoned cobra strikes not so much to punish the tormentor, as out of wounded pride.

The prosecution of these measures, provoked by the denial of equality in the Empire, will be necessarily obstructed and rendered nugatory by the Gov-

ernment of India. In taking such an attitude, the Viceroy and his Councillors will only be increasing their own difficulties and goading the Assembly on to fixed and implacable hostility, which can only hasten the day of Responsible Government in the country. That would be a gain, not the less great for being indirect, of the course of determined opposition forced on the people and their chosen leaders at this juncture. These developments, which the immediate future holds in store, must be made clear to the constituencies at this general election. Their political education will thus receive an impetus which nothing else can give and candidates must regard it as their primary duty to obtain mandates in this behalf, besides canvassing votes in the usual way.

One is sometimes amused and sometimes irritated by the unscrupulous use to which the existence of castes in this country is put by our enemies. Subdued and chastened, we bow to the penalties inflicted on us by the law of National Karma. But how can they admonish us who profit by our divided condition and in not a few cases foment it? Are they our Providence? Do they set up as our teachers? If so, let them show us the better way by their example, and not quote our social strata as a justification for their unworthy practice. We are hungering, through our renovated religion and revived philosophy, for opportunities of teaching the world some spiritual truths. While these opportunities seem slow in coming, here is a degenerate Western world, copying our

caste system, our practice of segregation, our social iniquities and, alas, even our diarchy, our communal elections and our "disproportionate representation" of minorities. We are endeavouring to get out of these unhealthy institutions. The reactionaries and obscurantists in our country can wish for no better support for their outworn systems than their adoption by the civilised nations of the West in express imitation.

Far be it from me to ignore or even to underrate the enormous benefits of the British rule in India. I have often spoken and written of these and of the glorious mission of the British Commonwealth. And I hope to live to do so again in better times, when British Imperialism shall have shed its lower and assumed its higher character. But it is sad to contemplate a people with a high destiny within their reach and calling themselves a lesser League of Nations, setting up, after mature deliberation, a colour bar after the Boer pattern.

Hard as flint, dry as the Sahara, must be the Indian heart which can survey without emotion the long tale of wrongs and indignities to which our people have been subjected within an Empire that talks all the time of human brotherhood and even-handed justice. I cannot stop now to tell the tale. Let us look at Kenya. We have gone there for some centuries now. The British Commonwealth came there only to safeguard our interests. Not only did we furnish the occasion, but we exerted our influence

to establish a British Protectorate. The earliest British officers thought that the new territory could be a suitable outlet for congested Districts in India. Our cooly labour built the Railways. In fact, to-day not only the Railways but the Government offices are run by our clerical labour. The currency system was ours till it was supplanted recently to the ruin of Indian wealth. The Indian Penal Code was introduced. Our armies fought on the soil of Kenya more than once to keep the Union Jack flying. We are the only people now that do anything to teach and train the Native in the arts of civilised life. Great numbers of Indians were born and bred there. After many years, during which we were invited, employed and encouraged, to be now told at the bidding of a few narrow-minded Whites, that we are a danger to the Native; that we are a moral and physical infection and that our future immigration must be controlled and finally stopped;—this is a refinement of ingratitude and tyranny, the thought of which still lacerates my heart, though it has been my constant companion, night and day, during some months.

It may not be pleasing to Government, but it is good for them to know that there is hardly an intelligent or patriotic Indian who does not interpret and lament the Kenya settlement in the way I do. It may not be pleasing to Government, but it is good for them to know that there is hardly an intelligent and patriotic Indian who does not

consider the settlement as setting aside a long succession of righteous pledges in the direction of human brotherhood, in favour of an unrighteous pledge made by incompetent authorities and in the face of earnest protests. It may not be pleasing to Government, but it is good for them to know that when I declare the attenuation of my faith in the British Empire and in the British professions, the only Indians, even in "Moderate circles" who dissent, are those who avow that they had never any faith in either. The Kenya settlement is a grave National humiliation. It shakes the foundations of our public life. Party interests and party shibboleths seem now an irrelevance as well as a heavy handicap. I am happy to believe that the members of the Servants of India Society are unanimous in their desire while remaining true to the Liberal creed and that of its Founder, to co-operate with men and women of all parties in the country in trying to get the grievous wrong righted and in the speedy achievement of Swaraj, which is the sovereign need of the hour.

Reply to Gen-Smuts.

The Right Hon'ble V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, requested by the Associated Press of India at Bangalore to make a statement regarding the Imperial Conference, said :—

OF several references made to me at the Imperial Conference in London there are two, which may not be fully understood without a statement from me. I will deal first with the remark of Mr. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister of Canada, casting doubt on the helpfulness to the Indian cause of my recent visit to that country. These are his words :—‘ I say that, for that reason that I am not so sure, that Mr. Sastri’s visit made it easier for us to deal with this problem. I would put it this way. Mr. Sastri’s visit helped to direct the attention of the country to something which I imagine a greater part of the country knew nothing about. Once however, Mr. Sastri began delivering speeches, labour councils from one end of the country to the other began to receive communications from labour organisations of British Columbia, asking them to take care of and see that such standards as labour had won in British Columbia were maintained.’

Mr. King had foreseen this sort of result from my public speaking even before I landed in Canada.

Once while I was still in Melbourne and another time, as soon as I landed in Victoria, I was advised that I should avoid public speaking in his Dominion. After anxious thought, I resolved to pursue the course which I had pursued in Australia and New Zealand and make an appeal to the electorates themselves on behalf of Indians. On Mr. King's own testimony I was not unsuccessful, seeing that the people "from one end of the country to the other" were made aware of the disability under which their Indian fellow-citizens have always laboured but of which they were till then ignorant. Ventilation is the first step towards the redress of political grievance. Mr. King's attitude however is quiet intelligible. It is not every Government which welcomes a movement for the rectification of a public wrong. The authorities think first and foremost, of the embarrassment that may be caused to themselves and of other things only afterwards, if at all; but the political agitator must remember that no omelette was ever made without breaking some beautiful little eggs and that as a South Indian proverb says, mere mantras did not bring down the mango at any time. Besides, if, acting on Mr. King's advice, I had observed the rule of silence, India would have found it difficult to understand the situation and, to compare small things with great, an international or rather inter-Dominion incident would have been created which would have given my Dominion tour of 1922 a character quite different from that which

it now bears. May I say, not unhappily as might be guessed, Mr. King's half-hearted complaint was seized upon for his own purpose by that master of political and diplomatic strategy who spoke for the Union of South Africa? I will quote relevant passages from his speech: "So far as I can judge, the atmosphere has become really worse in the last two years for the resolution on this question in South Africa, undoubtedly it has become worse. That is due partly to the visit of Mr. Sastri and his speeches in the various parts of the Empire to which I do not wish to refer with any particularity. The Prime Minister of Canada has said what the effect of the visit has been in Canada and in South Africa; it has undoubtedly emphasised the difficulties that existed before. That was one of the reasons why I thought it might not be wise for Mr. Sastri to come to South Africa. Our difficulties are great enough as they are". It was at the end of the 1921 Conference when the delegates were taking leave of one another, that General Smuts warned me not to go to South Africa until he should tell me the time was ripe. I thought at the time it meant never and I wondered too how he, of all people, could suspect the possibility of my visiting South Africa, which, by his own emphatic action, had been carefully excluded from the scope of the now famous resolution.

WHY MR. SASTRI DID NOT GO TO S. AFRICA

The explanation was that during our discussions a somewhat unpleasant exchange of recollections had taken place regarding the visit of mine to South Africa

which had been contemplated the previous year but had not come off. Lord Chelmsford's Government had proposed in 1920 that I should proceed alone with Sir Benjamin Robertson to watch the Indian case before the Solomon Commission of Enquiry which had just been appointed. The Government of General Smuts would at first have none of me, but as my name was pressed by our Government, they stipulated that I should be warned that I should be treated only as Sir Benjamin's social inferior. In answer to further enquiry they explained that owing to the activity of the Anti-Asiatic League the feeling against Indians was running so high that it might not be possible to find me suitable hotel accommodation, that I might be subjected to indignities and that if I accepted social inferiority from the start, I should have no right afterwards to complain of unequal treatment. Our Government protested against the extraordinary proposal and succeeded finally in getting my name accepted but not without an expression of regret on the part of the Union Government that, owing to my association, it would not be possible to extend to Sir Benjamin Robertson all courtesies and hospitalities to which a representative of the Government of India was entitled. I was by no means eager to drag down Sir Benjamin to the black man's level, nor did I consider it wise for one, who was to plead for the equality of his countrymen with other subjects of His Majesty, to begin by admitting his own inferiority. In the end, I felt constrained to decline in

the circumstances to proceed to South Africa as the Government's representative. My decision at that time, brought hard words on me from critics in India and several expressions of natural disappointment from our countrymen in South Africa, but the entire correspondence between the two Governments has unfortunately been by means of secret cables, which I could not then divulge for exculpating myself. What, however, was my surprise when General Smuts disclaimed the responsibility for it in 1921; how could a constitutional Governor-General, I wondered, purporting to speak on behalf of the Government of the Union, have raised a tremendous difficulty of that kind without the knowledge of his Prime Minister. I tried to probe the matter further, but succeeded only in discovering that there were other things than the partition of Bengal, of which no one was desirous of accepting paternity. All information that has since come to my knowledge regarding Sir Benjamin's deputation in 1920 goes only to vindicate my judgment in refusing to join it on an inferior status. Let us indulge in the hope, however faint, that the exchange of invitations and offers of hospitality between the Maharajah of Alwar and General Smuts may herald the fall of the barrier, which now baffles all diplomatic skill of the India Office and the Government of India. General Smuts has other remarks about me. I am thankful and proud that Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru associated himself and also, in fact, millions of India with my demand of equality with

any class of His Majesty's subjects within the Empire. The people of South Africa, except the Cape, are unable to tolerate even the mention of that demand. Their constitution and their traditional belief alike forbid it.

AN INSOLUBLE PROBLEM

A shrewd English friend, in whose rounded experiences as well as sturdy liberalism I have the utmost faith once observed that the question of Indians in South Africa was simply insoluble. All that can be hoped for is complete isolation of that Dominion. The Cabinet of Great Britain incurred a serious responsibility in permitting Boer ideals to travel beyond the borders of the Union. Till Kenya and the whole of British Africa, excepting the intractable patch where the only choice is between General Hertzog and General Smuts, are completely emancipated from the colour prejudice which threatens the very conception of human brotherhood and hang like a black cloud over the future of the race, it is impossible for Indians or indeed for any non-white races to feel safe within the British Empire.

Sir Tej Bahadur has devised and the Imperial Conference has blessed the means of accentuating the isolation of South Africa. I am not prepared, (how can I be), to say that it will succeed. But I hope with all my heart that it will. Having supported him, we are now bound to try the plan with all our skill and vigour. This does not mean that we should relax any of the efforts which the non-official opinion

has by concensus resolved to make in order to bring home our undeniable rights to the Imperial authorities in London. We cannot afford to do so till we see tangible proof that the Kenya wrong will be righted. On one point there could be no doubt.

DR. SAPRU'S SERVICE

Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru has rendered a service for which he is entitled to the admiration, gratitude and love of all sections of his countrymen, nor can we withhold from Lord Peel the meed of appreciation which he has richly earned. It is a pity, but truth requires that one should qualify the appreciation by the remark that the Secretary of State's gallant stand is somewhat belated. Lord Reading's Government have crowned their sustained and brave advocacy of the Indian cause by the complete confidence and support which they have apparently extended to their accredited representatives during these difficult negotiations.

Speech at Bangalore

The following speech was delivered by The Rt. Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri on the eve of his departure from Bangalore, where he stayed for over three months to recoup his health, at a large public meeting convened to bid him farewell. After some remarks of a personal character, Mr. Sastri said :—

HAVING failed and not, as some of you said, succeeded in the mission entrusted to me, I feel like a person who has fallen from a high estate. You gave me a great commission. I went forth knowing that it was difficult, knowing too that many another stronger and braver fighter for India's cause gladly avoided it. I knew that I should fail. But I undertook the task, because I knew that my failure would not matter, that perhaps through my failure somebody after me would be enabled to build up a success that you and your children of the future might really cherish as one of India's achievements within the Empire.

KENYA LOST, EVERYTHING LOST.

Don't expect me to go fully into the recent history of this Kenya affair. But you will forgive me if I make a few observations which I cannot keep back in this my first public speech, after an enforced but temporary retirement. Well, "Kenya lost, every

thing lost." You have been reminded of that expression of mine more than once this evening. I really feel that in this case of Kenya, a good deal is bound up of vital importance to the whole future history of this country. It is difficult for me to speak with moderation upon a subject touching so deeply, not merely our interest, but our pride as Indian citizens. I will, however, forbear to use language that might seem to abuse the hospitality of an Indian State, but certain observations I must make on this occasion.

THE REAL INWARDNESS OF THE AFFAIR.

Some one said that the history of the Kenya betrayal might be read in a public document. Believe me, friends, if you wish to know the real inwardness of affairs, do not pay any attention to that fuliginous document which they call the White Paper. It does not contain the true history at all. The actual facts at the bottom of the case will not be found in the discussions that ensued in Parliament, they will not be found in the respectable newspapers of Great Britain, they will not be found, no, not an allusion to them, in the vast flood of oratory that marked the proceedings of the last Imperial Conference. No reference has been made in these solemn papers to the fact that the British Cabinet gave this decision—because the white people in Kenya threatened rebellion. I do not say that the British Cabinet got intimidated. I do not say that the custodians of the Empire shrank from a trial of strength with such a petty little place as

Mombassa or Nairobi. That is not my meaning but those who are responsible for the conduct of the Empire to-day did shrink from a struggle with their own countrymen; if they ventured to put forward a regiment, the regiment would refuse to act. That was the secret of the whole thing.

THEY WERE ANGRY WITH ME.

The White Paper discusses the question as if on its merits and on its previous history. No reference, however, is made to this subject. When I, caring only for truth and for India's honour, mentioned it for the first time to a public audience, they all seemed aghast. They seemed to think that I was giving utterance to something which ought to be hidden from the public gaze. They were evidently not proud of the transaction. They certainly were very angry with me. Friends and critics, newspaper oracles, Members of Parliament, those who were glad any time to welcome me in the street and shake hands with me as fellow-citizens, all thought that I had been guilty of a sin of the most grievous description, much like the sensitive daughter-in-law in a family, who, having received a beating from the husband, smarted under it no doubt, but far more because the brother-in-law and sister-in-law had been looking on. The British Cabinet and the public of London were not so ashamed of their having yielded to fear and inflicted grievous wrong on India. They were far more angry, because I had taken the world into my confidence.

WE OUGHT TO HAVE A DIFFERENT GOVERNMENT

And now, what are our defenders doing? The Government of India, all honour to them, stood by us to the very end of the discussion. Perfectly true, they gave us every moral support they could. But when the time for talk had gone and the time for something substantial had come, when we had to tell the British Cabinet that, if one side threatened rebellion, we should at least threaten a little trouble, when the time had come to say that, our Government necessarily shrank back—you could not expect the agents of the British Cabinet to take up that attitude. Then, let me tell you, for the first time more vividly than ever, for the first time more stirringly than ever, I felt that if we were to win our way in the world, we ought to have a different Government altogether. What is the state of things to-day?

THE IMMIGRATION BILL

The Government of India, in order to hearten us, say: "Now that matter is gone, let us not weep over it, because all is not lost. There is the Immigration Bill coming on. We will discuss it threadbare, attack all its provisions from A to Z. We will see what the Kenya people will do and what the British Cabinet will do." We are going certainly to have thick books filled with discussion about Clause A and Exception B and Explanation C. But I assure you that it is the case of the young lad who was bidden to hold a runaway bull but was foolish enough to let the nose rope go and then hung on for all he

was worth by its tail. You know what would happen to that innocent young adventurer. Well, the people of India and the Government of India are in no better case. When the British Cabinet allowed the Kenya Government to control our immigration on one pretext or another, the case was gone. The horse had been stolen, you might shut the door bang a hundred times after, but you could not recover it by any discussion, however meticulous, however ably conducted, of the provisions of the Immigration Bill. I do not say that nobody should care about it. I do not say that the Indian Chamber of Commerce in Bombay, for instance, must not busy itself with necessary representations to the authorities of Kenya. Let them by all means do so. But the essence of the matter lay here. When they said that it was necessary to administer Kenya in the interests of the African native and that for that purpose it might be necessary to control immigration, as a theoretical proposition we had no alternative but to agree, and we might willingly and gladly agree, as people long accustomed to the galling chains of subjection and anxious therefore to help anybody, even Kenya natives, to get back their rights from the white aggressors. We could well agree to that, and we did.

But the point is this, that the unhappy African native has his only friends amongst Indians, that the white settler there is a landgrabber, that he is a political tormentor whose one business is to oppress, to keep down, to make selfish laws, to exact labour

'from poor people there, to use their energies for his own benefit; in other words, to use the language of one of their accredited spokesmen, having stolen the lands of the native, the next thing was to steel his limbs. If immigration was to be controlled, the immigration of the white man was to be controlled, and not that of the Indian. That is an attitude that we ought to have taken and that is an attitude that we should yet take in the matter. I expressed it several times in London. I have nothing to conceal and I will say that again. But there comes the trouble. Do you expect Lord Reading to say so for you? Do you expect Lord Reading and his Government to say that if immigration has to be controlled, it has to be in the case of whites and not of Indians? Every one of them might feel so, and I believe in my heart of hearts that every one does feel so, but nobody dares to say it; and yet if we are to win this case, that is the thing, however unpleasant, to be said. There again comes a handicap in our having a Government, which can only go a short way in championing our rights, which cannot speak the full truth, which cannot speak as you and I would, which cannot tell the British Cabinet, "Be impartial, be just if you dare and tell your own people not to do wrong."

THE ELECTIONS.

There is another point that is being forced upon my attention. However unwilling I was to recognise it in such vivid colours in the past, I can no longer

conceal from myself that without a Government that we could make and unmake as free people, we are bound to lose in the struggle in future. It is to that great object that all our energies have now to be bent. All talk of moderate and immoderate, of extreme and mean in Indian politics, has now no meaning for me. All must unite round this banner of Dominion Status and that promptly. What do we hear from the representatives of British power in India to-day? I do not envy Lord Reading this task. I certainly do not believe that fate has been excessively kind to him in calling upon him, liberal as he is in politics, to go about the country on the eve of a general election and tell the people: "Your struggles for an immediate constitutional advance will meet with *non-possumus*. Elect, therefore, people who will be content to go on the present footing." Well, he might say so, but the country has decided otherwise. Weak and disunited almost like a baby in her politics, India has, it seems to me, still spoken out boldly, I mean through the general elections. India has not heeded the warning which, bidden or spontaneously, Lord Reading thought it fit continually to administer to our people.

KENYA AND ANGLO-INDIANS

Now what do the great people who have to guide us in all these matters say? I mean the great representatives of the Anglo-Indian press, the great representatives of the British press, or those who, occupying high and responsible posts in the Indian Civil Service continually admonish the Indian patriot on

his duty, tell young and old alike without any bias or partiality that if we place the whole of the Indian finance at their disposal and, perhaps, abolish the posts of Accountant-General and Auditor-General, everything would go well with India. They tell us: "What are you doing? You, people of modern India are not like your forefathers at all. Your forefathers talked of Life Everlasting, of the eternal round of *Samsara*, of the vanity of all worldly effort. Why hurry? There is an Eternity before you. Did they not speak of life after death? You live for ever. Why want equality at once? Wait" Applying this argument to the immediate problem of Kenya a great friend of ours, in whose good intentions I still have faith of a sort, mind you, told me: "Really you are unreasonable. It is true that there is no perfect equality between your people and mine in Kenya. Those fellows have got 11 seats on the Legislative Council and have given you 5. Well, I admit this is an inadequate number. Certainly it ought to be increased and I am perfectly willing when the time comes to give my vote for 6." Who knows, ten years hence, or twenty year's hence, another enterprising man may come forward and tell us, 'we will give you seven,' and twenty years after that a still more beneficent-minded statesman may be willing to go ahead and venture to vote for 8, so that in about two or three centuries we shall reach the figure 11. Now that man was quite sincere. He thought that it was good enough progress for the Indian. An Anglo-

Indian Civilian here told me : " If you want increased Indianisation, you are now, say about 11 per cent in the Services; you get it raised to 12 or 13, if you please, and be done with it. Don't disturb us for another generation." Well, that is the way they have begun to talk to us. They do not deny the justice of our case. Only they are somewhat disquieted when we wish to rush along at this furious rate threatening the peace of India and the safety of the Empire, but are willing to agree to " a more wholesome, better ordered rate of progress."

THE HARDENED BRITON

Now I come to the most pathetic part of the whole thing. There are some amongst us who believe that, for one reason or another, we must bide our time and obtain our due, may be more slowly than we wish. If finally we are sure that we shall get the thing, let us be content to march at even a slower rate than heretofore. Let me tell you frankly that I am one of those who sympathise with this line of argument. I also have always spoken for peaceful and constitutional progress, and I believe, examining my heart as minutely as I myself can, I am still on the side of peaceful and constitutional progress. I am quite willing that we should move slowly, provided that we were sure that our faces were set in the right direction and that day by day, year by year, we left things behind that were in front and got along to positions which seemed too far off, provided that we were sure we were moving and moving ahead. But

"are we sure?" is the whole question. I thought we were. I do not think so any more, and therein lies my apprehension for the future. The Englishman, having once been generous, is now afraid of his generosity. He thinks he has given too much and there is a disposition in England which, I am thankful, is not universal, but is undesirably prominent amongst the Die-Hards and Tories, who now wield the destinies of the Empire—there is a disposition on their part now to think that if they cannot actually take back, it is best to keep things stationary. You may plead justice, equality and the necessity of fidelity to promises and pledges and engagements. That does not touch the hardened Briton when he is bent on safeguarding his vested interests. I have seen it, Justice and equality, very well, fine things these. All homage is due to them and the Englishman is ready with his homage as well. But if a conflict with his interests arises, if without open barefaced denial he could keep off the evil day, he would by every means in his power. That may be human nature, and some of you may say we are no better perhaps. We are not, any how we have not been, keeping an Empire, we do not wish to preserve rights stolen from other people. We do not wish to aggress and, therefore, let us speak with our limited experience and not test ourselves in any imaginary scale. The trial has not come to us and we may well, therefore, tell the people who boast so much about their principles of justice and human brotherhood: "Keep

your engagements like honest folk, fulfil your promises like just kings, that take their power from on 'high and must use their power so as to be approved from on high." That we have continually to tell them.

VESTED INTERESTS AND BRITISH JUSTICE

Lord Reading, to whom we have to look for guidance, from whom the words that come are certainly entitled to our respectful attention, counsels us in our future struggle to put faith in the sense of justice and righteousness of the British nation. Well, allow me to speak with a little freedom on this part of the subject. "The sense of justice of the British Nation" is an expression with which I am fairly familiar. I have used it on countless occasions. I know its full meaning, but I know, alas, its limitations also. There is a sense of justice, I will admit and admit to the full, but that sense of justice is not easily mobilised every day. You have got to stir it up and nothing stirs it up as the prospect of excitement and turmoil and trouble, as the prospect of something being in danger of some vested interests being squashed in the struggle. Nothing stimulates the somewhat inactive sense of justice as the manifestation of your political strength.

A PAGE FROM PAST HISTORY.

Let us read the history of England. You remember some time ago, in the old days of the Ilbert Bill controversy, when nothing more serious was at stake than the continued enjoyment of an invidious pri-

vilege, the Europeans of Calcutta and the neighbourhood, on the occasion of this threatened loss of privilege, banded themselves together and went so far as to arrange for the deportation of Lord Ripon. He was to have been summarily seized and put on board a boat that had come up the Hooghly. Remember, however, no injury was to be done to him. Only he was to be deposed from his august position and taken away to be safely deposited somewhere on the more hospitable shores of Great Britain. That is how they teach us how to preserve rights. You have all read English history more or less. I will only go back to the recent struggle in Ireland. Did the Irish people have no faith in the sense of justice of the British nation? Oh, they had, and they had plenty of it. Only whenever they made an appeal to the sense of justice of the British nation, they also made an appeal to some other sense, so that two or three senses, quite awake to the situation and acting together, might do some little justice. And how did the white people in Kenya behave when their rights were threatened? No not their rights, let me say their unjust privileges. They did the same thing. They gave notice to the Governor that if he was going to give anything like equal treatment to Indians or carry out laws to that effect framed by the British Cabinet, he also would be treated in the same gentle way in which the Viceroy of India was treated on the Ilbert Bill occasion. They had everything ready for seizure, not only of the Governor, but of

his senior officials. Their places of detention were actually fixed.

CHAMPION OF KENYA WHITES.

That is the way in the British Empire their own people, when they want things done, go about the business. One of you, heroically inclined, may say: "If I should do such a thing to-morrow, what would be my fate?" I cannot promise him the treatment that they gave, for instance, to Lord Delamere in London. Lord Delamere was received everywhere. His words were listened to as if they were gospel of truth. He had a seat in the House of Lords. The Duke of Devonshire was smilingly sweet on him: so was the Colonial Office from top to bottom. There was nothing that Lord Delamere could not do. And yet it was Lord Delamere who, as Executive Councilor in Kenya, had taken the oath of allegiance to His Majesty, had promised to administer laws and to do nothing to disturb the peace of the public and so forth, and whose duty it was to preserve the public peace—it was Lord Delamere who had presided at countless meetings where the white people threatened to rebel. He had himself presided and assisted at these disorderly proceedings. He was a man who, if the ordinary law had prevailed, should have been treated in the manner in which some thousands and thousands of our people are being treated to-day.

OUR CONSTITUTIONAL BATTLE

I cannot promise you a treatment of that kind from the Government of Lord Reading, but you know

where you are exactly. You could do things, if only your skin were white, which you cannot think of doing, being what you are. But within your limitations, within the law, within the limits recognised as allowable to those who are struggling to regain lost liberties, who are struggling to obtain the slow fulfilment of pledges of longstanding and of solemn import, there is plenty which we, non-officials, may do. There is plenty for us to be doing night and day, and it will be my proud privilege, when I have left your kind and hospitable neighbourhood, to take my humble place amongst those who fight this peaceful and constitutional battle.

INDIANS OVERSEAS AND INDIAN STATES

May be, I have done wrong to pour into the contented and placid ears of the citizens of the model State of India the meanings and wailings of my anguished spirit, but I think the question of Indians Overseas affects Native States as well as British India. Moreover, I look forward to a time not far distant when the distinction between British India and Indian India will be one of form and not of substance. I look forward to a time not far distant when you will consider yourselves in daily life and not merely in theory, as citizens of a large, beautiful and lovable India and not merely as citizens of Mysore. If to me and to those of my age that India is but a vision, there are about me young people who will raise glad and joyful eyes on that dream as the realised spectacle of daily life, and I believe you will forgive me if,

for a moment, I have asked you in anticipation of some years yet to share with me some of the troubled thoughts with which the British Indian citizens are now oppressed.

FAREWELL

I hope you will allow that I have not wasted your time, as I believe honestly that I have bestowed one of my afternoons well, when at the close of three months' stay amidst such generous surroundings I take leave of all who have helped to make my stay happy. I do so not leaving behind in their hearts a feeling that I have gone away as a sphinx having come as a sphinx, but having told the trouble of my heart and some little plans that I may have formed for the future, having in that way tried to repay some of the hospitality and tenderness and personal attachment that the citizens of Bangalore have always been extending to me during my stay.

Immigration into India Bill

Speaking in support of The Hon. Sir Devaprasad Sarvadhikary's motion in the Council of State (13th Feb. 1924) on the Immigration into India Bill the Rt. Hon. Mr. Sastri opposed Sir Maneckji Dadabhoy's demand for a Select Committee and said :—

SIR, I will try to meet some of the observations that have been made by my Honourable friend Sir Maneckji Dadabhoy in the course of his speech suggesting the appointment of a Select Committee to consider this Bill. I am of opinion, Sir, that this reference to a Select Committee is unnecessary. The Honourable Mr. Karandikar said that, in his judgment, the Government of India were really the representatives of the Indian people, and that, if there was a strong wish expressed by our people, the Government of India would not be behind-hand in giving legal embodiment to it. I do not wish to traverse that point at all, but I hope that it is true, and that the Honourable Mr. Karandikar will in no long time prove in the judgment of his countrymen to have been a true prophet. At the present moment, however, there is one slight consideration which abates from the satisfaction that one would derive from such a proposition. The Government of India and their spokesmen tried all they could to oppose

the passage of this measure in the Assembly. It was passed, and it is now coming to us under the aegis of a private Member of the House. That is as it should be. But, if the Government of India were really possessed of strength of feeling upon this subject and they wished to make themselves, in the fullest and amplest sense of the word, understood in the Dominions, they would have come forward at the earliest possible opportunity in this House with amendments, such as the Honourable Sir Maneckji Dadabhoy wishes to make, so as to make this measure effective, satisfactory and creditable to the Council of State. The Government have not brought forward any amendments. It is not the Government that propose to refer the Bill to a Select Committee. Am I wrong in inferring that the Government are quite content to let the Bill encounter its fate on the shoals of the discussion in the Council of State?

The Honourable Sir Maneckji Dadabhoy spoke of the distinction between reciprocity and retaliation. There is a very great deal of distinction between the two. The only question is how far the distinction bears on the point in issue. For one thing, Sir, the fundamental distinction between the two expressions cannot be lost sight of. Reciprocity is in good and in bad matters; retaliation can only be in bad matters. If the South African Government sent us two professors to teach in the Delhi University over which the Honourable Dr. Mian Sir Muhammad Shafi presides, then we should be acting reciprocally,

if we sent two professors to the University of Cape Town; we should not be guilty of retaliation in that case. Now, retaliation we apply, however, to disabilities, to hardships and to indignities. This is a retaliatory measure. Who could deny it? I am prepared to defend this measure of retaliation and, if a stronger measure of retaliation were possible, I could defend it too in any Court of impartial judges. Would the Honourable Sir Maneckji Dadabhoy believe me if I said to him that in 1921 General Smuts himself asked me "We have recognised your power to retaliate. Why don't you retaliate? If we ill-treat your people, you are at liberty to ill-treat our people." General Smuts should not be dissatisfied with any measure of the character that we are attempting to pass to-day. General Smuts would not be, if I know his nature.

As for dissociating ourselves from the Empire, I should like people who talk carelessly to note one or two things. This expression, Sir, "dissociating ourselves from the other parts of the Empire, detaching ourselves from the other parts of the Empire" was brought in by a Government spokesman in the Assembly during the debate which we are following to-day, and Sir Maneckji Dadabhoy has used that expression here. I do not wish to speak without a sense of responsibility, and I hope I shall not import any emotion into my answer on this branch of the subject. Reviewing the history of Indians abroad, one can only hang down one's head here. If we were

brought to the bar of the public opinion of the world, the Indian would have to hang down his head in shame that he has submitted to these things for nearly 35 years and still longed and hoped for a remedy because he did not wish to be thrust out of the Empire. He has paid heavily for his desire to be associated with the Empire, and dearer and dearer prices are being exacted at every turn. To tell him that he would dissociate himself from the Empire by enacting an innocent reciprocity measure is to abuse the language which the Almighty has given us. Sir, to-day after unparalleled indignities we are not seeking dissociation from the Empire.

We are still going down on our knees to ask the authorities from outside to find some means of consulting our self-respect, so that we may still continue within the Empire. It is not we, it is the other members of the British Empire that thrust us out, that tell us continually "we cannot digest the black colour of your skin. We should like you to remain within, but if you must, go out." Let me assure Sir Maneckji Dadhabhoy that there are certain Dominions which will have no compunction whatever. It is not we, Sir; we wish this association to continue. The only thing is we wish this association to be put upon a proper basis. The great point in passing this measure to-day is that we shall have told the British Empire that we are no longer the old Government of India and the old people of India. Would some of my friends believe me when I say that the Dominions

'would not have continually insulted and humiliated us if they did not feel certain that India was not governed by Indians, but governed by the British people who, in the last resort, would do nothing in the way of reciprocity or retaliation. They knew that they could play with us and our feelings. They knew all the time that the Viceroy and his Executive Government were still strong, could hold down India and choke the natural expression of India's feelings. That is why they went on from bad to worse, and are now going on in the same way. We wish to tell them that the Government of India Act, 1919, if it has any meaning, has this meaning that it has enabled the Indian people to give natural expression to their feelings. I am not quite sure, Sir, that I have spoken the exact truth when I said that the Government of India Act has given them that power. We know too well that there are still impediments in the way of the wishes of the people of India finding their natural expression, but I do hope in this case that the Government of India, I mean the Executive Government, will permit the wishes of the people of India to find their proper expression and not use the undoubted powers they have of impeding, of distorting and finally of misrepresenting India, as in the past. It is for that purpose, Sir, that I wish the Bill to pass to-day, so that it may stand on our Statute-book as a feeble, belated, protest in the shape of some bit of law against the continued misbehaviour of the British Cabinet and of the Government of the Domi-

nions. It is still in the power of the Government of India under this Bill to keep it inoperative for as long a time as they please. Everything is in their hands for the Bill is content to enunciate a principle and leaves everything to be done by a very very wide rule-making power. Such defects, or some at least of the defects as have been pointed out to-day, could still be remedied by the Executive Government making the necessary rules. If there are gaps, they could fill them up. If, for instance, any thing is not roped in, as Sir Maneckji said, again reproducing a note struck in the Assembly, the Government would perhaps bring in an amending measure. When they find they cannot touch Kenya, I am sure the Government of India, if they mean to act in this matter, would come in with an amending measure which would satisfy Sir Meneckji Dadabhoy. But I have rather a suspicion that that is an undue apprehension. The Government of Kenya, Sir, have now passed a measure with a very fully developed franchise law. I have a doubt myself although I venture to express it with great diffidence, that it would be inconvenient to operate a franchise law, as they have had in the last three years, unless they had also a law of domicile.

A word was said on a somewhat delicate matter to which I must make a reference in sheer honesty of statement. We were told that we should perhaps by this measure touch certain members of the Indian Civil Service and other services, and that we should introduce certain measures which might savour of

undue personal harm. Sir, nobody in the world would be more unwilling to do anything of that kind than myself, but if it is necessary in order to protect the self-respect of India, I should not shrink from it, much as I should hesitate. Sir Maneckji Dadabhoy has overlooked another consideration which he might have brought in to terrify his Honourable Colleagues in this Council. It is not so much members of the Indian Civil Service and other services that would be affected by it, it is many gallant officers in our Army. I believe Sir, though I should like to receive some confirmation, I believe, Sir, there are many gallant officers in our Army who come from the Colonies and the Dominions, probably more than will be found in the services. It would affect them too. That would be a stronger measure than this. But are we, in taking up a big subject like this, which is one of retaliation against the Dominions, to be defeated by that consideration

The Honourable Sir Maneckji Dadabhoy : I did not say that at all. I said that we could make a provision to guard against that. The Honourable Member has entirely misunderstood me.

The Right Honourable V. S. Srinivasa Sastri : Speaking of the point that I raised, after the most careful consideration of the subject, I have satisfied myself that, if His Majesty could be implored by us not to grant any more commissions in the Army of India to persons of Colonial domicile, we should not be doing any wrong to ourselves, but we should be

vindicating our natural and just rights. If this measure serves to keep out gallant officers of the Army, even then I should support it without hesitation.

Then Sir Maneckji asks us why we hit other Possessions besides South Africa. He has assured himself that South Africa is a grave sinner and against her retaliation would be justified: but he still has a warm place in his heart for the other Dominions. Now, as I read clause 3, the other Dominions would have no right to complain; for all that we say is that people coming from those places shall have no greater rights or privileges in India than they accord to our people. I do not think they have any just cause of complaint.

The *Honourable Sir Maneckji Gadabhoy*: Then why include them?

The *Right Honourable V. S. Srinivasa Sastri*: There is only one other remark that I will make. Sir Maneckji complained that, if this measure were passed as it is, it would detract from the character of the Council of State as a revising and correcting body. I believe he is quite right in that contention. Perhaps it would be satisfactory if the subject were of a somewhat different character and admitted of delay and we could introduce certain clarifying clauses. But I call this matter urgent because I should like, if only His Excellency could give his assent promptly, I should like to see before the present session closed, this Bill on our Statute-book and the Dominions in-

formed that at last it is the people of India that are legislating in this country. Then they would behave differently. Moreover, the point is this. If we put this Bill on the Statute book as it is, where is the difficulty or where would be the difficulty in amending it later? Perhaps the Honourable Sir Maneckji Dadabhoy need not bother himself; once it gets on to the Statute-book I am sure the Government of India would then think that it was part of their duty to amend the Bill in order to make it operative and we shall then have a Bill which would satisfy the critics, of whom more than of the necessities of India some Members seem to be solicitous here.

There is only one other word which I would mention. This Council of State has its character to maintain, and I would ask whether this Council would maintain its character better by promptly passing this Bill or by agreeing to an amendment which may end in the shelving of the Bill or in its being deferred to another Session or in its resulting in a tie between the Council and the Assembly which might lead to another six months' delay, if it did not kill the Bill altogether. I would ask those who wish to vote in favour of the amendment whether they would not surely attack the character and prestige of the Council of State by that means?

Africa or India.

The following speech was delivered by The Rt. Hon. Sastri at a Meeting of the Criterion Club, St. Stephen's College, Delhi, on the 24th Feb. 1924 :—

THE title of my subject to-day is "Africa or India?" It seems to be an alternative which it is hard to present to anybody. I have not invented it in order to attract a crowd of listeners. But the alternative, "Will the British Government care for Africa or for India more?" was presented in a somewhat acute form to the British Cabinet during the progress of this Kenya difficulty. You know Kenya is only a part of British East Africa. But the white people in Kenya are drawn to considerable extent from South Africa. In fact our countrymen allege that while, before the advent of these South African whites, everything was smooth sailing, after they came and settled there, the trouble of the Indian community began. But it is not a trouble between whites and Indians in Kenya alone. It is unfortunately largely aggravated by the circumstance that the South African whites have openly declared themselves to be in sympathy with the whites in Kenya.

The great man who rules over the destinies of South Africa, General Smuts, lent the weight of his

authority to the agitation of the white community in Kenya. He backed them to the utmost of his power and I heard at the India Office that he sent many a long cablegram to the British Cabinet, advising them, threatening them, and generally warning them that the British Cabinet were not dealing with Kenya only, but with the whole of Africa, meaning the whole of white Africa ; and in the course of the discussions it became evident the question would be, will the Indian case prevail or the African case prevail? I have not told you in detail the way in which the cause of the whites in Kenya and the cause of the whites in South Africa became identical. It is not necessary to our purpose ; but it was they who presented to the British Cabinet this alternative : " If you are going to redress the so-called grievances of the Indian community, you would be driving us out of the Empire. The Indians tell you for their part than if you were going to decide the issues in our favour, India would have to go out."

Now, the British Cabinet was obliged in some way to settle the question as though it were a case between Africa and India. I will only mention in passing that at one time the propaganda of the whites reached such proportions that it looked likely that it would be a case not only of Africa *versus* India, but of the whole of the Dominions and Crown Colonies *versus* India. Luckily, the Dominions were too sensible and too aware of the magnitude of the difficulties of the Empire to throw in their lot with

Africa. So it shrank somewhat into the dimensions of a struggle between India and Africa.

‘Ladies and gentlemen, when a question assumes that importance, we must extend our sympathy to those that have to deal with it on that footing. So we who went to England on this Kenya mission always asked ourselves, what should we do, if we were in the position of the British Cabinet? I am afraid the persons who came over to plead for the cause of the Kenya whites failed to rise to the height of the occasion and did not look at the problem from the point of view of the British Cabinet charged with the maintenance of a world-wide empire, but were too full of their own little troubles. Now, you might ask me “Why is Africa pitted against India in this matter?” Now it is alleged it is not only a question of economical interests, but it is a question of two cultures and two civilisations struggling to occupy the same ground. That is how they put it: not that we wish our culture and our civilisation to be planted in Africa to the detriment of anybody, but they always put the case, as though India were behind this movement and were struggling to obtain a large and secure foothold on the continent of Africa, so that she may thrust her hungry millions on the soil of Africa and thus not only dispossess the whites, but in course of time dispossess the natives of Africa also. Now in South Africa there is a very peculiar constitution, which, I think, the English people did not fully understand when they annexed South Africa, or

they would have tried to establish some sort of compromise: because the ideal which the South Africans have is injurious and diametrically opposed to the ideals of the British Empire. British Empire ideals are well-known. Happily, the British Cabinet, low as they have fallen in their power to maintain those ideals, have not yet repudiated them. Those ideals, as you are aware, are justice all round, equality all round and brotherhood between all peoples composing the Commonwealth. In South Africa the *grandwet* or fundamental law includes the declaration. "There shall be no equality between white and coloured persons in church or state." For long decades the South African white, who is the Boer predominantly, has had to struggle with the blacks of Africa, and therefore has from his very upbringing the notion that the black man is unequal to the white, that he is born only to serve the white, and that if he will not serve the white he should be compelled to do so or killed off as soon as possible. Between the white and black therefore, they will never grant equality and they conceive that the black man of Africa is the prototype to which the Indian also must be consigned, and they treat the Indian really the same way. Well, it may be right or it may be wrong—I am not here to argue the case either for or against the South African Boer. But the Boer is there, every moment thinking of this ideal of the white man's natural and inherent superiority over the coloured person. He is taught every minute of his

life that that is the true doctrine. No use of quarrelling with him. When therefore the British Empire annexed South Africa with this ideal which runs clean against their own cherished ideal. British statesmen undertook a serious responsibility and they must have vowed to themselves that, if they found it necessary to annex South Africa with this degrading doctrine, running counter even to Christianity, they at least were under a moral obligation to see that this degrading ideal never travelled beyond South Africa, that it was confined to this primitive population of Boers. They might have hoped that some day, some bold, some enthusiastic, some pious missionary might go and convert them to a decent form of Christianity ; but in the meanwhile they must have vowed to themselves. " We will never allow this doctrine to spread beyond South Africa."

But what happened in the case of Kenya ? White people from South Africa went there, carried their doctrine and reversed the current which Kenya affairs had run for a long time ; for an Indian aspect had been given to the progress of affairs in Kenya, which now the Boer was determined to check with a view, first of all, to restricting the immigration of the Indians and afterwards in course of time, as his power grew, finally to close the doors of East Africa to Indians altogether.

Now, lest you should think that I am overstating the case, I have brought you a memorandum which General Smuts presented to the Imperial Conference.

General Smuts at that Conference made himself the spokesman not only of the Kenya whites, but generally of Africa. He presented their case and you may remember it was mentioned in the papers at the time that his principal desire was to get repealed that resolution of 1921 of the Imperial Conference which recommended that Indians everywhere in the Empire should be granted equal rights of citizenship with any other class of His Majesty's subjects. Now, let me tell you at once that, although General Smuts at the 1921 session of the Imperial Conference was no party to this resolution, and even expressly dissociated himself from it as a person who was present at it, I can tell you this much—that it was quite open to General Smuts to take his stand on the understanding that no resolution should be passed which was not unanimous, and he could therefore well have said at the time, "As I am not a consenting party to this resolution I will not allow you to pass it." But, ladies and gentlemen, far from taking that position, which he was entitled to take, General Smuts was so impressed with the Indian case, with the difficulties which the Empire was experiencing in holding together, that he actually said, "Although it is not possible for me to join, my sympathy is with Mr. Sastri; let this resolution go; I do not mind; provided it does not bind me." I am mentioning that in prominence because it has been lost sight of and something hangs on that little point, trifling as it may appear to you.

Gen. Smuts comes forward in 1923 and tells the Conference, "It was a mistake of yours to have passed that resolution ; you ought now to repeal it " ; and he puts it on the express ground that equality is an idea foreign to the Empire. Whoever thought of equality between people and people in the Empire ? He says so openly ; and it is worth while for me to read that to you. The whole of his memorandum is very interesting reading, and I would like you to read it at leisure some day. It is a short document, but I shall read only the relevant portion.

There is no equal British citizenship in the Empire, and it is quite wrong (this is the point) for a British subject to claim equality of rights in any part of the Empire to which he has migrated or where he happens to be living. There is no indignity at all or affront in the denial of such equality. Once this is clearly recognised the stigma above referred to falls away.

There is no equality—so we will treat Indians as our inferiors, but there is no stigma in it and Indians have no right to feel it at all. That is the kind of argument that Gen. Smuts addressed to the Conference. But of course he went further. Instead of confining himself to a mere statement of that sort, being the General that he is, and accustomed to carry the war into the enemy's territory, he has given a paragraph to an attack on me ; and for what reason ? —above everything else, that I had decided to tour through the Dominions and speak of equality, and he says that by so doing I have not advanced my cause even a bit ; and certainly in South Africa the feeling against Indians is now much more bitter than before. Certainly it would be ; whoever denied it ? If you

went and claimed equality with a proud and arrogant people of that kind, no doubt they would be opposed to you; but would you expect me, would any intelligent Indian expect me or any other spokesman to shrink back from expressing the idea of equality merely because it might offend the white people in this part or in that part of the Empire? That was my sin, and this is how General Smuts describes the thing :—

This latter change is in some measure due to the Sastri mission. Mr. Sastri by his mission and his speeches has undoubtedly made matters worse; he has for instance never failed whenever an opportunity presented itself to attack the Indian policy of South Africa and thereby has greatly exasperated public opinion in that dominion, already very sensitive on this issue. In other dominions he has made people alive to the issue—(Great sin on my part, isn't it?)—indeed he has largely created it. The claim he has everywhere vigorously pressed for equal franchise and rights for Indians over the whole Empire, has not only gone further than the local claims of the Indians themselves—(I will recur to this point a little later)—but has tended to raise opposition in quarters where it did not exist before. It is because I foresaw this development that I did not invite Mr. Sastri to include South Africa in his tour." (Loud Laughter).

Now, a statement of that kind coming from him, ladies and gentlemen, you will allow me to produce before you as emphatic and conclusive testimony that my mission was not a failure. I have roused opinion in these parts. I have told these people that the Indians claim equality and have disturbed the equanimity of Gen. Smuts and his Boer followers. It is something to have done. I was very much concerned the other day to read in a paper that our honoured friend Lala Lajpat Rai quoted, Gen. Smuts's testimony as to the failure of my mission. This is not

failure as I read it. It means that I presented my case as you would have had me present it, and that it brought me the measure of success which it was possible to attain in all the circumstances. Now, ladies and gentlemen, I come to another part of Gen-Smuts's memorandum.

The other day in our legislative house, I mean *our* legislative house, the Council of State (laughter), we passed, the Government of India remaining ostentatiously neutral, a reciprocity measure which Dr. Gour had persuaded the Assembly to pass last session. It was feared by some of our timid friends in the house and perhaps also Government shared the fear, that if we enacted a reciprocity measure, that is to say, if we returned blow for blow to the whites in the Dominions, they would be greatly incensed and they would do much more harm and we should be seriously injuring our position. I told them, "I have known General Smuts; Gen. Smuts is certainly not a timid or a vacillating exponent of white opinion. I have met him before and he has told me personally that if we used our reciprocity power he would never take it ill at all: in fact he expressed surprise that we had not done it already in 1921." Here is what he says:—

"India should be free to deal with nationals of the dominions on a basis of reciprocal treatment and neither on her part nor on the part of the dominions concerned should there be any resentment or ill feeling in the matter."

So we have done nothing wrong. General Smuts should say "Well done, India", and I am sure he does.

But you may ask "Very well, you have done it : where shall we be next?" Ladies and Gentlemen, permit me to tell you one thing : that we were not the first people to throw a stone at our neighbours in the Empire. We had never done it, before : we had suffered ; we had been humiliated ; we had been deeply pained ; but we never hit back, hoping by our patience, by our resignation, by our Christian virtue of submission, to convince the white tyrant that he was continually misbehaving against the law of God and man. It did not pay us. At last we have taken one puny step of what is called euphemistically reciprocity. I had to explain one thing to my colleagues the other day, the difference between reciprocity and retaliation. It is a curious Empire, it is a curious political organisation, this British Commonwealth. Curiously are we, heterogeneous people, mixed up together in this wonderful unit, that instead of exchanging amenities and expressions of good will and preferential duties and so forth, we should be engaged in the task of exchanging blows and taunts of retaliation. We did not make this Empire. Those that made it and those that keep it in such a condition ought to be ashamed of it. We need not hang down our heads ; we are trying everything, let me tell you, to keep this Empire together ; it is the European, the white man in the Dominions and in places like South Africa and East Africa, who will not tolerate another people in his household, except they be serfs and slaves and helots—it is he that is the danger to the

Empire. He is the wrecker; we, if anything, are preservers of the Empire.

Then, ladies and gentlemen, General Smuts has made another statement which is exceedingly interesting. He says, "What are these Indian people asking? They forget the essence, the first thing, the A. B. C. of politics." It would appear that we are not an independent Government like Japan or China, and yet this is what he says:—"Neither the Japanese nor the Chinese people have claimed what these Indian people claim." Now, as an assertion it is emphatically untrue. Only a Boer could put it forward, because the Japanese and the Chinese feel their exclusion from citizenship rights, the same as we, and being stronger and backed up by an independent government their protests are much more vehement and they get, let me tell you now, being backed up by their own government, they get more humane and better treatment from these Colonials than we do.

Let that pass. But then, is it just to maintain that we who belong to this Empire, who own the same allegiance and salute the same Union Jack as much as any white man, is it right that we, who fought for the Empire and saved these very white people from extinction (Applause), is it right that we should be told that we have no more right to demand equality than the Chinese or the Japanese people? What, then, is the inducement to remain within this Empire, if there is no difference between one who

belongs to the Empire and one who is outside the Empire? Is there no difference between the German whom we had to fight in time of war and us in time of peace? If we are to be treated worse than the Austrian and the German, what place have we within this Empire? And yet General Smuts puts us this question. He says:—"The Indian Government should not claim from other Empire Governments what the friendly Governments of Japan and China would not claim, and the fact is"—as I have told you, it is not a fact,—“that with neither of these Governments have we any difficulties in the dominions, while the difficulties with India are notorious and growing.”

Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, I must ask you to listen to me with some patience and give me a little time, for this a very important and large subject. It concerns our honour. If I therefore keep you a little longer than the customary lecture period, do not blame me. Now they say, after returning from the Kenya mission, I am a changed man. I do not take it ill at all. I am not inclined to think that is an ill compliment. If there is any Indian who can go through the experiences through which I went in connection with this Kenya mission, if there is any Indian who could have seen the things that I saw, who could have heard the sentiments which I was compelled to hear, who could have experienced the utter lack of responsibility that it was my misfortune to encounter in London during a few weeks of bitter

sorrow and suffering: if there is any such Indian, I think, Ladies and Gentlemen, most of us should disown him. I have changed. Any Indian would have changed. General Smuts in another part of his speech, blamed me for using a harsh expression and stigmatising this Empire as a Boer Empire. It strikes me as extraordinary that General Smuts should be ashamed of it. He should be rather proud of it. If I said that he was able to spread his doctrines and impose his ideals on the whole of the Commonwealth, why does he not take it a compliment? Evidently, he felt that he was in an uncomfortable position, because I was drawing prominent attention to the fact that the Kenya decision was calculated and intended to please the Boer. He took that very ill, and he blamed me for it; but so long, Ladies and Gentlemen, as there is a colour bar, so long as there is a first class citizenship and a second class citizenship created in response to the demand of either the Boer or the Britisher who is not ashamed to follow the Boer, so long as that is the case within the Empire, I am fully justified in using the expression which I did, and discarding the expression, the British Commonwealth.

There are many people who think that I was quite wrong in stating that the Kenya decision was based on a certain amount of fear of the whites in Kenya who threatened to rebel. Now that is quite true. It could be proved at any time. In fact the white Kenyan was rather proud of it. He came

and said, ' We are going to fight the British Empire. Well, they talked about it all over the place, the newspapers were full of articles on that subject, and even a magazine like the *Nineteenth Century and After* was quite willing to admit an article in which it was openly stated that the white men in Kenya had arranged everything for a rebellion. Well, I am not going to detain you by trying to prove these facts. But there is a point in it. There are a number of innocent people here, Englishmen, Englishwomen, Britishers of all shades, quite innocent people—I do not blame them at all—who tell me, ' What ? Do you want us seriously to believe that the British Cabinet was afraid of a few thousand whites in Kenya and therefore gave an unjust decision ? Oh no, it is impossible. We who put down the Germans at a tremendous cost, do you mean we are going to be afraid of the white Kenyans ? ' But what is the logical inference of such a claim ? If you say and if people believe, as I am afraid there are a few ignorant people in the Government of India who believe, that the British Cabinet did not give this unjust decision out of fear of a very tiresome rebellion, what, then, led them to give us this palpably unrighteous decision, which disgraces the Empire and which blackens the name of the British nation ? Why did they give this decision, then, if not out of fear ? Are these innocent people prepared to say that the British Cabinet was inherently vicious, loved injustice more than justice, did not care for the long

course of pledges and promises and brushed aside wantonly their own ideals which they had held out to other people? Oh, I prefer the other alternative, because I know it is in accordance with the facts of British history, especially of recent British history. Let us believe it, and I would ask you to believe it; if you are lovers of the British name, as I am, in spite of my great resentment and vexation, if you are lovers of the British name, never come and tell me that they were not afraid, but loved injustice for its own sake. Lord Olivier, who criticised the Kenya decision the other day, showed a much firmer grasp of the reality. Lord Peel—I must speak of his lordship with great consideration, specially because he is no longer in the India Office now,—Lord Peel, when I was there, specially told me, “Now Mr. Sastri, do please moderate your language; do not let your mastery of English lead you to a fall; do not generalise. Especially, do not mention the words ‘equal citizenship,’ ‘equality’ and things like that. They won’t go down. English people don’t love these abstract expressions,” Now I owe to Lord Peel many kindnesses. I received much assistance from him. But he took too much on himself to advise me that way, and I never forgot, in spite of his lordship, that the British people are lovers of justice and equality all over the world.

Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, I wish to say one word about the mission that is proceeding in the course of the next two weeks, if possible, to get

this wrong righted, and I will only permit myself one remark. Amongst them there is one, His Highness 'the Prince Aga Khan, who appreciates the real nature of these wrongs. In my frequent talks to him, I remember one expression coming from His Highness again and again. He was referring particularly to our franchise rights and immigration rights, and he said: "Whatever we surrender, whatever we might have to compromise, we cannot compromise on these two fundamental rights. We have no right to compromise on these two things, because they do not belong to us or to the Indians resident in Kenya: they belong to the Indian nation; they belong to our children and our children's children; we have no right to disgrace posterity within the British Empire. Whatever you yield, Mr. Sastri, do not yield on this immigration question." I am glad His Highness has accepted a place on this Kenya mission, and while he is there, I will continue to hope that he will exert his utmost to press our demand. Because even when we were in London, good friends at the India Office used to tell us frequently: "It is all very well for you three fellows of the Indian Legislature to come up and say, "Oh, we will wreck the Empire and we will do this and that", but pray, don't you think of the good of the Indians resident in Kenya? Would they like you to use these harsh words? If the Kenya whites are wrong, you must not be equally wrong on the other side. Your mission, as we understand it, is to try and do what little

good you can to your countrymen in Kenya. Go down on your knees, surrender, compromise and abandon anything, if you can get them a little good, no matter what happens to the Indian name—but benefit your countrymen in Kenya.” Now Ladies and Gentlemen, this is in many cases, well-meant advice. In other cases, however, it is not well-meant. They always tell us, who are struggling for large liberties, “We will give you some little, be quiet”, and so they silence generation after generation. If we are looking always for the praise of the powers that be, if we are desirous of getting a pat on the back, why blame them for bribing us with little gifts so that we may forget, like children, the big things that India is hungry for and that she must get if she is to take her place among the nations of world? Sir Malcolm Hailey put a question at the last session “What would your countrymen say there? Do they want you to retaliate and hit back and enter on a franchise war with those whites? Won’t they suffer much? After all, you can hit only one white man or two; they can hit lakhs of your people at one stroke”. Yes, I have asked many Kenya Indians what they would want. We had a very strong deputation of the leaders of Kenya Indians working with us. I told them particularly: ‘Now this is primarily your matter; we have come here to assist; do tell us what you would like; would you accept the crumbs they offer and ask us to lay down arms?’ ‘No’, to a man they said. ‘We come from a nume-

rous African Congress. We are resolved to fight this battle to the bitter end. Do not surrender. It is not we who are concerned. It is India's honour we are concerned to maintain. We would rather be killed by the rebellious whites in the streets of Nairobi and Mombassa than that India yielded a jot of her honour and self-respect.' (Hear, Hear). Well, what are they doing there to-day? History is repeating itself. Just as when in the bitter years before 1911, longer than I care to recollect, Mr. Gandhi and his brave South Africans undertook a campaign, in the face of terrible odds, of passive resistance, just as when our Bengali countrymen, sore at the Partition, declared a boycott of British goods, finding that everything else failed, just as on those two occasions we Moderates and Extremists, title-hunters and revolutionaries, all of us joined together and said: "We will stand by these countrymen of ours. It is true they have taken a strong step, but what could the poor men do?"—so have we now to stand by our Kenya brethren in their sore hour of trial. After making every attempt at pacification, the Congress there has declared non-payment of the poll tax which they considered unjust and inequitable. What are we going to do? Are we going to say to Kenya Indians, 'We cannot support you in this extreme measure?' I hope we shall rise, even as we rose on the two memorable occasions I have named, I hope we shall rise to the full height of our nationhood and support our Kenya Indians in their hour of bitter, alas, it may be to-day, losing struggle.

Lord Hardinge once said to the British Empire, "What could the poor Indians do in South Africa? They are perfectly justified in inaugurating passive resistance." May we expect Lord Reading or the Honourable Sir Narasimha Sarma to declare some day before the session closes: "What could the Kenya Indians do; we are behind them in their refusal to pay the poll tax"? And now, you may say that some of us in arguing this question are going a little beyond the proper limits when we say, 'Oh, if we were a Dominion, if only we were a Dominion!' and then our critics, not altogether white critics, I mean some Indians too, say: "You must be utterly foolish to talk like that. How could it benefit you if you were a Dominion in the struggle against a white people? Even if you were completely independent like China and Japan, you could do nothing." I do not say we could despatch our army; I do not say we could fight these people on their own ground; but I do say this, that our case would be advocated on the highest ground, that Government of India would not be afraid to stand out and say, we are altogether and completely for the Indian case. What do you find on the other side? The Government of Kenya is entirely at the disposal of the whites of Kenya. The whites of Kenya rule the province. The Government are doing everything that the whites of Kenya ask them to do. The Government of India here put their finger on their lips and say, "Don't say that, lest you displease the other side." And is it likely that we shall

go to the wall or that we shall come triumphant out of the struggle in which the people on the one side have a Government which is constantly afraid of the other side, or a Government which completely identifies itself with its own people and comes forward and puts the case of the whites against the black, Africa versus India? Will our Government say in its turn "India, not Africa"? I ask you, if we have no such Government, don't we stand certainly to lose in this struggle? That is the difficulty. If we had a Dominion Government, the Viceroy would speak as we wish him to speak to the outer world. Instead, the Viceroy speaks to us as he is bidden to speak by Lord Peel with the British Cabinet behind him. Well, that is why we ask for Dominion status. We find that, pitted as we are against a people who have a Government solidly behind them, proud to stand up for their subjects and not afraid of the British Cabinet, we have a Government that go a certain distance—I am not denying it—but then are prevented by the constitution, by the fact that they are agents of the Secretary of State and of the British Cabinet, from going as far as they should. That is the chief difficulty.

I have mentioned only one general consideration. Shall I mention to you two points in respect of which our not being a Dominion is a severe handicap in this struggle? Do not misunderstand me. I am not quarrelling with individuals, but I am bound to draw your attention to this, unpleasant as it may seem, Oh,

mightily distasteful as it would be, to the British Government here. We are going to send a delegation to fight our case with the Colonial Office.' Mind you, you must dismiss all prepossessions from your mind, and tell me whether you would allow that delegation to be headed by an Englishman, by a white man? He may be the noblest, the most philanthropic, the most pious Christian; he may completely identify himself with our case. But do you expect him to forget that there are certain things that he cannot say and that we should say? For example, when driven to the wall, we should say to the British Cabinet and to the Colonial Office, 'How dare you expect after this decision that we should remain in the Empire?' Do you expect such a good man—even as Lord Willingdon—to say that for you? There is almost nothing, I know, that Lord Willingdon would not do to uplift and to raise India's name. If you do not expect him to say that, it is hard to find any Englishman for that position. I go so far as to say that it is an Indian case, in which the bitterest feelings are entertained by the Indian people. It is they, then, that should present this case before our adversaries. Why, have we not got men here who can do that? Have we not got men whose loyalty, whose empire patriotism are unquestioned? It is a very difficult office for an Englishman. It is an office which we should naturally and properly and rightfully hold. Assume now we were a Dominion for one minute, assume that everybody in the Assembly and in the

Council of State was in a position to exercise power, the usual legislative power over the Cabinet ; would they dare go and ask an Englishman, merely because he had administered a province, to head such a delegation ?

There is another question. You all know that the British Cabinet has decided that Kenya should be administered for the benefit of the African native and not for the benefit of either the white man or the Indian. As you know, we accepted that decision with enthusiasm. We said that is the right and the only proper view to take of the case. Only we begged the British Cabinet to see actually carried out any policy and any measure which would protect the African native. But they have now ruled that our immigration should be controlled. We will pass by the plausible fallacy, the misleading sophism that they employ in describing it. They do not say the Indians should not come ; all that they say is that people who follow this profession and that profession and the other profession (only Indians follow these professions !) should not come or that they would be prevented from coming in. So while on paper it does not look like racial discrimination it is intended to be and it is going to operate as a racial discrimination.

Now, let us assume that in the interests of the African native it was necessary to control immigration. I will convince any impartial man that far greater danger to the African native comes

from the British immigrant than from the Indian immigrant. The unhappy Indian immigrant is weak they will not protect him; he is only an economic competitor. The African native himself could crowd him out or he may be told to clear out, unless he means to make trouble and shed blood and do a hundred other things which I will not mention. But you read history. You have read about the way in which the white man, when he comes to live amongst black populations, among uncivilised peoples, uses his power, his superior civilisation, his superior command of fighting materials, his superior command of the destructive weapons of human warfare. Lynching is not an Indian word, is it? Well, flogging comes easily to the white man. Why, the other day, some Kenya white, it seems, was shocked at the idea of anybody preventing him from flogging the African native. "What is the African native for and what am I here for?" That is the way he thinks. I ask you in all honesty, from whom does the African native stand to lose more? From the Indian who is only a competitor at the most, who may be told to go any moment, or from the white man who goes and stays and tyrannises and exploits and steals land and limbs and liberties and refuses to yield them up? Is he an easy man to deal with? Let India answer. Only the other day we made a national demand for our liberties, and what answer did we get? When the Englishman is enthroned in power, when he commands the purse, when he controls the political

liberties of another people, when he is established in economic ascendancy over another people, he does not let go easily. When he does wrong, none of his compatriots will say so, while he is alive. Some time after perhaps, a historian professing to ransack old libraries and the India Office records might say "Oh, he might have done better", but as a rule the white man, especially in power over coloured populations, is hard to displace. If the British Cabinet desired to become trustees of the African native and therefore wanted people of certain kinds not to come into his country; if there were a *bona fide* disposition to find the people really harmful, really dangerous to the colony and keep them out, I should say every time, keep out the white man. Well, even some of you may think it is an astonishing doctrine for me to propound to you. Perhaps some of you wonder, uneasily, why you ever came here. But that is the honest truth. If we were a Dominion Government and our principal spokesmen went to England, they would not hesitate to say, "If you want to protect the African native, keep the white man out." And yet, what did the British Cabinet tell us? "No, no. We are not going to restrict you by mentioning you as a race; but we will carefully enumerate all the occupations that you follow in East Africa and we shall say, men following these occupations shall not come". And yet the Government of India write a serious *communiqué* to the press and say, "It is a great thing gained that Indians are not going to be

excluded as a race by legislation," as if it matters anything to us whether we are going to be excluded as a race or as the followers of our own peculiar occupations; whether we are going to be excluded by legislation or by an ordinance which is derived from the law of the land, what does it matter? We are to be excluded one way or another.

Now, there is only one more word which I shall say before I conclude. In following controversies of this nature you would be sometimes impressed by the fact that there are a great number of Anglo-Indian newspapers here who have the fairness to allow that the Indian Case is good and sound and who sometimes go further and blame the white people of Kenya for their un-Imperial narrow outlook; and perhaps you will think that it is a very satisfactory state of things. I dare say we must be thankful for small mercies in this world; it is a very good thing and I am willing to acknowledge assistance and sympathy from whatever quarter it comes. But I have noticed another thing also, and we must put the two things together. I went through the Dominions and as I described the transitional stage in which our Government stands, how there are still large departments of administration to accrue to our people, how we are still suffering from bad law, from ill-understood conditions, they said: "How tiresome of these English folk! They have long held India; they always say they are there only for the good of the Indian people; why don't they give you self-government and quietly go back?"

Now, the white people abroad are quite willing to give you their sympathy when you fight the British people here ; and these British people here are quite willing to give you in their sympathy when you fight their white kinsmen abroad. So we have sympathy exactly from the quarter which is unable to translate that sympathy into anything like practice. Like sensible people we ought to take notice of this—the colonial white man, not interested in maintaining his ascendancy in India, thinks that the Britisher here is wrong ; and the white man here, who is not interested in Kenya personally, thinks that his white kinsman there is wrong. Our deduction is that both are wrong. But whether here or there, the white man teaches us how to maintain our ground ; the white man teaches us how to defend our liberties and our rights. The moment he is offended, he does not pause to consider, “ What will this man say and what will that man say and what will my Government say ? ” He hits you straight in the eye, straight ; that is what he did when he had a quarrel with poor President Kruger ; he did not wait to convince the world. Those that have power are not restrained in their use of it, while we, that have not the power, try to deceive ourselves that this world is governed entirely by reason and by justice. There is a certain scope for argument, for reason, for adjustment. But there are stern limits to the operation of these enlightening influences. Beyond that limit our operations have to change and assume a new phase. Now, ladies and gentlemen,

let me not allow you to misunderstand me. I will declare exactly what I mean. The time for argument, for cool presentation of a case is there. But there is also a time when you are expected in this world to use such power, as you have, honourably and, let me add, constitutionally. It is those that shrink from using even that power, lest it should displease the powers that be, who write themselves down in history as people that do not deserve any power. That is my reading of the situation. I wish this were a different world. I wish the War had really taught us the lessons that we thought we had all learnt. I wish the British Empire really stood for those principles of justice and fair play and human brotherhood of which we dreamt a little while ago. Those principles and ideals are still there, and perhaps the next generation of Indians will live in a time when it is sufficient to show, that our cause is just, for it to prevail. I am painfully driven to the conclusion that that time is still to come. In the meantime we cannot afford to lose the battle in Kenya or anywhere in the Empire. But if occasionally you hear from me advocacy of some measure that may seem to be of a combative character, be sure it is not actual fighting, for we have not the fighting strength. We are essentially non-violent. But such as we have, such means as we have of ensuring our self-respect, it is not only weakness, but it is treason to our people, it is betrayal of our children not to exercise with due restraint, with due submission to the Almighty who knows how

to judge the right from the wrong and can pull down the mighty from their seats, with due submission to Him, but with a clear consciousness that in the prosecution of our own right, the exercise of lawful means, peaceful pressure, constitutional power, is not only rightful but dutiful. In that consciousness we have to fight our battles. (Loud Applause).

Resolution on the Colonies Committee.

At the Meeting of the Council of State on March 10, 1924 The Rt. Hon. Sastri moved on behalf of the Hon. Mr. Natesan a resolution touching instructions to the Colonies Committee with regard to the Kenya Immigration Bill. In moving the Resolution Mr. Sastri said:—

SIR through your courtesy I move, on behalf of the Honourable Mr. Natesan :

"That this Council recommends to the Governor-General in Council that, as soon as practicable, he should cause to be published the brief of instructions to the Committee which will confer with the Colonial Office on the Kenya Immigration Bill and other matters concerning Indians in that Colony, and the materials placed at their disposal in so far as they have not been published already."

Sir, one or two remarks seem to be called for with reference to the Committee mentioned in this Resolution. This Committee has been long in being constituted, and even now my information is that it is without a Chairman duly appointed. It is a matter for gratification that the personnel of the Committee has been chosen and the date of their departure has been fixed for the middle of this month. I am sure the Council would like to send their good wishes to this Committee who are about to proceed on behalf of India to undertake an arduous and extremely delicate negotiation. I am perfectly sure that their

high sense of patriotism and their fearless advocacy will bring triumph to our cause. Another remark that I am compelled to make with reference to this Committee, is that nothing is known yet of the status of this Committee, about which an important statement was made by Dr. Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru at the Imperial Conference and later, the public have been told on his authority that this Committee will have the power to deal directly with the Colonial Office and that they will not be mere agents of the India Office in this particular matter, and that in that way India will have gained a step in constitutional status. Dr. Sapru was at that time the agent of the Government of India and I presume that it was with the knowledge and consent of the Government of India that he made a proposal of that far-reaching character. In answer, however, to a question which the Honourable Member in charge took full time to consider before answering, he stated that nothing was known on this subject yet, and that as soon as something definite should be known he would inform the Council. Now I think it a great pity that even on the eve of the departure of this Committee, nothing should yet be published authoritatively as to the definite status which they are going to enjoy. Now before dealing directly with the subject may I, with due respect, say a word about the attitude of the Government of India towards this subject of Indian disabilities in Kenya? Honourable Members of this Council will bear with me for a

minute if I ask them now expressly to associate themselves with me in according a very high praise indeed to the courage, to the pertinacity and to the faithfulness with which the Government of India have championed our cause throughout this whole affair. They have, it is well known, recorded their protests and their remonstrances up to the point that constitutional propriety will allow, and I think there is not a man in the country who follows these matters who will not admit that the Government of India have done quite as well as they could, subject to the limitations of constitutional decorum to which they are subject like other people. It may be asked, then, why do I bring forward a Resolution asking for the publication of papers? Sir, we are not fully perhaps, but we are by character, a democratic constitution. The authority the Government of India have, the prestige they carry, the attention they command, are all derived in the last resort from the exact correspondence that at any time prevails between them and the intelligent section of the people of India. Nobody will deny that, if the representations of our Government have carried any weight so far, they have done so merely because the Government had a coherent, well-expressed, definite public opinion behind them and backing them. It is necessary that this agreement between the attitude of Government and public opinion should be maintained and that the mind of intelligent India should be kept actively employed on this subject and quite alert to the ever-changing

nature of the situation. Now, suspicion, misgiving, distrust—these ought to be eliminated as far as possible from the proceedings of this Government. To ask for the publication of papers is the commonest thing in the English Parliament when they wish to obtain a definite statement from Government on the exact stage that a negotiation has reached. Secret papers, confidential documents, demi-official correspondence, that passes between different authorities may not be revealed, but their substance must, so far as possible, be made known to their public in order that they may have informed opinion, and not merely highly excited opinion on materials supplied by ignorance. I hope, therefore, nothing will be said to impugn the motion which prompts me to ask to-day for the publication of certain papers. There is intense feeling in the country in respect of this matter and there is further, whatever the Government of India may say in their *communiqués* and statements to the press, an uneasy consciousness that our last attempt in this matter, about the middle of last year, met with almost complete failure. I do not discuss, Sir, at the present moment how far that failure was complete. I know that Government have been very strenuously maintaining that we had substantial gains. I venture to deny that statement *in toto*. Such gain as we have had—and we have had one gain—was slight. Another gain on which stress is laid in Government *communiqués* was of a very equivocal and doubtful character, having been yielded in theory but taken

away afterwards in substance. And as for the rest, our record is a blank failure and there is no mistaking it. It is well known too that this estimate of our success on the last occasion was shared by the Government of India to a very large extent if not absolutely; for the House will remember that, when first the news of the decisions contained in the White Paper was announced here, the Government of India ventured to say that they could submit to those decisions, if they must submit, only under protest. 'Now that expression has of course been afterwards withdrawn to some extent, modified and interpreted away. We all know what that means. It means that the Government of India were not allowed by the priests who preside over constitutional ritual in England even to protest. Now, Sir, I must say that the people of India note these things, if not always with official eyes, with a sense of keen anguish when they find that, in their struggles with other peoples within the Empire, they are fighting behind a Government, whose weapons, such as they are, are used to the full extent without doubt, but whose hands are tied behind them. If it were in my power, I would persuade the noble Lords of the second House in the Imperial Parliament that it was not necessary certainly to erase from the vocabulary of a subordinate Government the innocent word 'protest', even though the Government is employed merely on the task of defending the inherent rights of the coloured subjects of His Majesty.

Then, Sir, Mr. Andrews, whose knowledge upon these matters, I venture to say, is not rivalled even by those who have access to secret documents, has definitely stated in one of his writings in the newspapers that some time ago a former Secretary of State, Lord Peel, made a secret compact with the Colonial Office—these are the words he uses ‘secret compact’, I am not responsible for them—giving away the stand that the Government of India had uniformly taken in respect of the question of the sale of lands in the Highlands. Such information as I have tends, unfortunately, to confirm this impression that Lord Peel did admit that, so long at least as he was Secretary of State for India, he would not raise this question of the free and unrestricted right of sale and purchase of land in the Highlands. Well, if that was so, it appears to me to be a serious mistake, to be a surrender on a vital point of the position that the Government of India have always taken; and I believe that the Government of India, if they knew this matter at all, should have placed it before the public of India and armed themselves with the necessary authority to repudiate this surrender. The Honourable Member in charge of this subject has throughout shown a reluctance to take the public into his confidence, which I think has not been conducive to the growth of that full trust in the doings of Government in this matter which, as I said before, is a fundamental postulate of success. Some time last year, apparently in September, he was inter-

pellated in Simla by one who was then a member of this House as to whether he would kindly publish the documents that led up to the White Paper. A negative answer was given, and the request was renewed this Session in another place to which that gentleman has recently been translated ; still a negative answer was given. Other Members also have been plying the Honourable Member with questions ; but he has throughout steadily refused to publish papers or to give necessary information. To a simple question as to the constitution of this Committee the Honourable Member, seeming to give an answer, gave a negative answer. The only information he vouchsafed me was that this Committee was going to be called the Colonies Committee ; and when I re-read the Viceroy's speech on the opening of this House and found that he had employed the word in two places in that speech, I said to myself the Honourable Sir Narasimha Sarma has succeeded in many words in telling me nothing. The Honourable Sir Narasimha Sarma has once sat on these benches and it will not be long before he resumes his seat here.

The Honourable Sir Dinshaw Wacha : I hope you will be there before long.

The Right Honourable Srinivasa Sastri : I hope not, Sir Dinshaw. And then I venture to think he will renew his experiences of the ravages of an appetite for information which, we feel, is tied away in those bundles before him, marked in all sorts of formidable labels, "secret," "urgent," "immediate," and so forth.

Sir, I have only to refer to two passages in the opening speech of His Excellency the Viceroy which seemed to us to call for some comment and to compel us to ask for information. I will read those two passages :

"The Kenya Government has treated Indians on the same lines as Europeans and granted adult suffrage. Given communal franchise, this method of working may be accepted, and it has now become law. It is open to our Committee, however, subsequently to make representations setting forth our contention that there are grounds for an increase in the number of seats to Indians and that in our view all voters should be registered on a common electoral roll."

This is satisfactory so far as it goes, but I wish to give a warning to the Honourable Member in charge, if he needs that warning—I am sure he does not. Apparently this passage seems to convey a sort of satisfaction that the Indians have been treated very generously by the Kenya Government inasmuch as they are now to be endowed with adult suffrage. That, however, is only a plausible sophism, as I shall hope to show to this House. Adult suffrage we did not ask for; adult suffrage it was not in contemplation to give us; but adult suffrage has for a wonder been given. I hope the House will understand the significance of this. Throughout this contest of our people with the white settlers in Kenya the question of a common electoral roll and a common franchise has lain at the bottom of our demand. The white settlers have refused to admit us to the common roll on the express ground—there is no mistaking this—that we are inferior citizens, and that it would not do

for them to come and canvass our votes or to have their votes canvassed by Indians. But they said, "We will treat you generously, magnanimously, with unexampled generosity and magnanimity, if you agree to be put on a separate roll with a separate representation of your own, put away in a certain compartment so that you could be strictly limited, whatsoever your franchise, how many soever you may be as electors; you may be millions, while we are hundreds; still, if we put you in a separate electorate of your own and give you so much representation as a community, you will never exceed that representation and we could always keep you down." That was their idea. Now by the giving to us of an adult suffrage, they have given us a preponderance of voting strength which is simply overwhelming, so that, if we were with our adult suffrage to be put on a common electoral roll, they would be absolutely nowhere, unless they jerrymander the electorates in a manner that will stand self-condemned. So that the grant of the adult suffrage now and the enactment of it in Statute is practically the closing of the door, so far as they are concerned, to a common electoral roll. For it is impossible for them now, with their deep-rooted ideas, to admit us to a common electoral roll. It is not, therefore a blessing, and I must object to the implication in this passage that it is a thing upon which the Indian community should congratulate itself.

Then there is an ominous reference here in this passage "to an increase in the number of seats to

which the Indian community are entitled." Emphasis is not laid, as it has been laid throughout, on equality of representation. Now, Sir, judged by the tight of the case, a preponderant majority in the community ought to have the preponderance of strength in the Legislative Council, but as the weaker party in this negotiation we have never asked for the preponderance to which we may be entitled and to which, when the European community are entitled, they would lay claim without any compunction; but we have reduced our demand and merely asked for equality. On the merits of the case, too, the white settlers have always governed the Government of the country. The Government of the country who have the majority of official seats all filled with white men would always be behind the white settlers, so that if the mere necessity of the case were to be considered, the white settlers do not need any representation at all in the Legislative Council. The officials there ought to represent them, but we do not take that line. We only wish them to have the same representation with ourselves. On the other hand, representation has been given to them which gives them now the power to outvote all other non-official votes together. Now, that seems to me to be unfair, and it is therefore to me a matter of somewhat ominous significance that in this speech the words "equality of representation" are avoided, and the words employed are "an increase in the number of seats allotted to us." Now the number of seats allotted to us is 5, the

number of seats allotted to the European community is 11, more than twice our strength. Now I know in the House of Commons and in the House of Lords some people were generous enough to say "Oh! they are entitled to some more seats, 6, 7, 8, !" Perhaps, some venturesome man may go as far as 9, but I do hope that our Government will instruct our Committee to accept nothing less than equality where, by all the rights and all the necessities of the case, we are entitled to something more than the other community.

Then there is another passage here to which also some attention has to be drawn, and that is the passage relating to the Immigration Bill :

"We took immediate steps",

says His Excellency the Viceroy,

"to urge the postponement of the introduction until the Government of India were able fully to present their objections, and at the same time we strongly pressed that the Colonies Committee appointed by the Government of India should have an opportunity of examining the question of restrictions on immigration embodied in the Bill."

Now that is a small matter. But the large question here is whether there ought to be any restriction on immigration at all. We have always taken the line, and the Government of India have taken the line, that the view to put before the Cabinet was that immigration might continue practically unrestricted as before without any prejudice to the African native community. That view must still be maintained, because the African native stands to gain by the

immigration of Indians, and, although it might seem harsh from my lips, I do not hesitate to say, as I have said it before, the African native stands to lose somewhat by the unrestricted immigration of the white farmer, of the white exploiter. However, I am willing that the African native should be protected equally from the white as from the Indian. It has been found, Sir, all over the world, where immigration restrictions had to be adopted, that no type of restrictions will operate evenly and impartially which are based upon considerations where elements of doubt and personal prejudice and individual caprice will come in. America, therefore, trusts to restrict immigration on a numerical quota principle. It is blind in its operations, it is impartial in its operations it may perhaps be unreasonable, but it is a thing that is understood, it is a thing about which there is no possibility of mistaking, it is a thing with regard to which there can be no imputation of unfairness or partiality. Should in the last resort immigration be restricted in Kenya to which be it remembered in pre-British days we had unrestricted immigration rights,—let it be on the American quota principle, and the Indian people, however reluctantly, might be induced to reconcile themselves thereto. But if restrictions are introduced based upon one pretext or another, there is nothing to prevent people suspecting, and we should be constrained at every turn to attribute motives, based upon experience, not blindly or wickedly, but motives based upon our experience and

our intimate knowledge of how these things work, and we should be compelled to question the good faith of any restrictions on immigration which are based upon such grounds as have been alleged in the White Paper. I hope our Committee will be allowed—and that is my point—I hope our Committee will be allowed to raise this question of the need of immigration restrictions, and not merely go into the character of the immigration restrictions and try to whittle them down in one particular, modify them in another or soften them in a third.

Now, generally speaking, in small minds accustomed to routine and easy views on matters there is prevalent an impression that the proper attitude of our negotiators in these matters should be, “how shall I benefit the Kenya Indian community”—not “how shall I preserve the honour and self-respect of the Indian?”—not “how shall I maintain unassailed the position of equality of Indians with our fellow subjects of His Majesty’s Dominions?” There are any number of advisers to tell us that our proper attitude is, “How can I get something to-day for my Kenya Indian countrymen, no matter how India loses in the struggle, how can I benefit them?” Now, Sir, I venture, in the name of India, to repudiate this slave mentality utterly; for I know that when once we assume that position, the bureaucrat will say, “Yes, the good of the Indian community in Kenya. And what is the good of the Indian community? That which it pleases me so to consider, not that which

the Indian community in Kenya vociferously asked for, "not that which their Congress may demand; not that which their chosen representatives may voice, but that which it will please my bureaucratic heart to consider as good for them." Now, Sir, I venture to protest most emphatically against this degrading doctrine. The Kenya Indians, whom I know through their best-representatives, do not want that India should surrender her case in the smallest particular for any small concession that may be won for them from a reluctant British Government. They wish India to fight her battle unmindful of any harm that might come to the present Indian community. Our honoured representatives, headed by—I should not say headed, because there is yet no head—our representatives, who go in the middle of this month to England, should be allowed to stand up for the dignity, the honour, the right and the claim of India to absolute equality with the Empire and the Dominions, and not merely to look at the question from the extremely narrow, restricted and petty-minded view of what may be temporarily good for the Indian community there. That is why I would, if I may, venture to say a word through this House and on this solemn occasion to our representatives who go forth with all our good wishes, to take no ignoble compromises now; if necessary to leave the question open so that, under better auspices and in happier conditions we might be able to re-open the question and lead the struggle to a more successful issue. But do not for

Heaven's sake, for India's honour and for the consolidation of this Empire, accept a compromise which we shall be obliged afterwards to repudiate. Sir, I would venture to remind the Council of the noble words used by His Highness the Aga Khan in this respect. He told me definitely more than once: "Our rights in this matter are nothing. But posterity, the Indian nation as a whole, have rights in respect of this Kenya struggle which no representative of India dare compromise."

Now there is only one word which I must say to the House before I resume my seat, a word as to the status of Indians as British citizens. To my great grief, and I make no doubt to the great grief of the Government of India, the status of British Indians is not recognised in the Dominions and the Colonies as it should be. If I may venture to say that rather pointedly in strange and utter contrast to that proverb which says, a slave who sets foot on English soil finds his chains snapped, in contrast, in opposition, to the spirit of that saying what do we find? Instead of British citizenship elevating the Indians, the Indian drags down British citizenship. It is a great pity. Our status and our position in South Africa was lowered after the British occupation of the Transvaal from what it used to be in the time of President Kruger, until it became a common place in Parliament that, to their shame, they were unable to protect India and Indians from those humiliations against which the British Government had themselves

protested in pre-British days. The other day, in a debate in the House of Lords, a remarkable incident happened which perhaps has failed to attract public attention. Lord Chelmsford, Lord Hardinge, and our late Secretary of State, Lord Peel, all alike drew attention to a strange anomaly. They said, "The Highlands in Kenya are open to immigration to the Greek, to the Bulgar, to the Italian, and they will be open to-morrow to the German and to the Austrian, whom the Indian has fought for our sake; but the Highlands are not open to the Indian and yet the Indian is a British citizen while these people are not." They said, "If the Cabinet found it necessary to accord to the white subjects of His Majesty concessions and privileges denied to the Indians, let that be so." and some of them did really approve of it. "but let not Indians be placed lower than non-British whites." Now a protest so authoritatively made and made with the sole motive of exalting British citizenship, when attached to a dark skin—that protest went unheeded, and should I go too far if I take this Council into my confidence and say, that three days before the White Paper was issued, and the Cabinet announced their decisions, when I went to the India Office, the India Office people were exultant over the victory they had won; for they told me: "We have won this for you that, though a white settler belonging to His British Majesty's Dominions will be preferred to you, no non-British white will be preferred to you. We have secured

that," they said. No, but the White Paper did not contain this victory, and that is why these noble Lords whose names I have dragged before you to-day thought it necessary to protest against that. Now I ask the House to realise what a degradation it is that, in spite of these protests, the British Cabinet should have been unwilling to accord to the British citizen, merely because he had a dark skin, that which they do not shrink from giving to a person who was not a British citizen but who could boast only of his white skin. Now I am not saying that this will remedy our grievances at all. We do not want to drag anybody down to our level. Our whole attempt is to raise ourselves through British co-operation, to the level of others. I am not therefore for depriving the Bugar of his rights to the Highlands, but I am for our being admitted to equal citizenship in the Highlands of Kenya as well as elsewhere. Sir, I move the Resolution.

India, a Dominion

The Rt. Hon. Mr. Sastri accompanied Mrs. Besant and others on the National Convention Delegation to England to press on the new Labour Government and the British democracy in general the urgent need for further enquiry into the working of the Indian reforms and the introduction of drastic changes in the Central and Provincial Governments in the light of the experience gained during the first term of the operation of responsible Government in India. Mr. Sastri, besides interviewing leading members of Government and Parliament, delivered several public speeches in June and July 1924, pressing the claims of India for Home Rule. He was one of the signatories of the Memorandum presented to the India Office, a memorandum which claimed the right of India to draft her own constitution in the same way as the Dominions and the Irish Free State did. On the eve of his return to India, Mr. Sastri and the Delegation were entertained at the Cecil Hotel, London, (July 18), by Sir Ali Imam. Replying to the host, Mr. Sastri said :—

I am returning to India very shortly, and perhaps this is the last occasion upon which I shall speak in public on political matters before I leave. I therefore wish to occupy a few minutes of your time* at

stating a few points that have arisen in the course of our discharge of our duty here.

In the first place, I am glad to think that during our stay here we have spoken freely and candidly to people, as the circumstances of the time seemed to require. We certainly have not minced matters. Some of you have read our Memorandum. It was printed in the daily press. That Memorandum contains in brief our sentiments and you may see that we have used direct language. We have said, for instance, that the unrest in India will continue, and it would not be right to expect anything else than that the unrest will continue, so long as Dominion status is withheld from her. We have said later on that the actual step which England must take is to appoint a Commission to go out to India and make direct enquiries as to the feelings and the wishes of the people in respect of the Constitution that must be framed to confer Dominion status upon her, and we wind up with a prayer that England may avoid the mistakes in relation to India which she committed in relation to other Colonies in the past, and which led to disaster, in one case, and through disaster, to some measure of prosperity in the others. Now those sentiments are no doubt harsh and unpleasant, but it seemed to us that this was the time when we must not speak with any reservation as to the condition of India.

People may ask, as they have asked, is it really so bad in India, are we heading towards a mutiny or

rebellion or general rising on the part of the people? It seems to us that that state of things is not very far off, but our view is not shared by the Europeans generally resident in India, whether official or non-official, and they seem to be sending here reports in a somewhat contrary sense, so that we find here responsible statesmen and politicians connected with India asking us seriously: "How can you make such sweeping statements, when our Viceroy sends home messages, saying that he can still carry on?" Now, of course, the Viceroy can carry on. I cannot conceive of a Viceroy and Government of India who will say at any time that they cannot carry on. The whole question is: How? The Viceroy is, under our present Constitution, empowered to pass and to annul legislation on his own account, without excessive regard to the people or their representatives. He is allowed, under our present Constitution, to impose taxes, and to take them off without the wishes of the people being respected. Furthermore, he has a Standing Army, at his disposal, maintained on a war footing. That army is under his complete orders, and they will not refuse to act, as we were told, for instance, that British forces very nearly refused to act against Ulstermen in Ireland, or, as they were expected not to act against the white population in Kenya when they threatened rebellion. Well, with these resources it would be a wonder indeed if at any time the Viceroy threw up his hands, and told the authorities here

that he could not carry on. If England waits to act until she received that message from the Viceroy she never will act. And now we come to another very important point. Is it the case that England has done nothing to meet the wishes of India? England has really given us a certain measure of Home Rule, and promised the consummation of this Home Rule, in the course of time, and by stages. Those people who have the honor of England in their hearts can no longer say: "We deny you your liberty." Those who wish to deny that cannot say so any more. They therefore use the language of delay, the language of postponement. "Not yet," they say, "India is not fit." And when they bring forward the conditions of fitness you will see that they cannot be fulfilled for a long, long time yet. To wait until the whole of India speaks one language, or until her 300,000,000 follow one religion, to wait until India shrinks to the dimensions of a small country, with a compact population, to wait until the Muhammadans and the Hindus had settled their quarrels and told the outside world, "We are no longer going to quarrel," is to wait, indeed, not for a generation or two, but for a long, long time. And yet it is that sort of objection upon which it is held that India is not fit for Self-Government. But then there is a smaller and narrower ground on which the official spokesmen of England have taken their stand. They say the provisions of the Act suggest a period of ten years before which no further steps towards autonomy can be taken. Now

some of you who are not "in the know" are likely to take these arguments at their face value. You may really think they are formidable and must be held to bar immediate progress towards Home Rule for India. I wish, however, to point out to you that you would be quite wrong if you allowed yourselves to think so, and I can quote the testimony of the Government of India themselves against such contentions. In the year 1921, in September of that year, a resolution was moved in the Legislative Assembly, in which demand was made that Self-Government be immediately and fully conferred on India. After a good deal of discussion the Home Member of the time, Sir William Vincent, now Member of the Secretary of State's Council, moved an amendment in these terms :

That this Assembly recommends to the Governor-General in Council (that is our formula at the beginning of all resolutions) that he should convey to the Secretary of State for India the view of this Assembly that the progress made by India on the path of Responsible Government warrants the re-examination and revision of the constitution at an earlier date than 1928.

Now, please remember, that this amendment was moved by the principal spokesman of the Government themselves, and it was carried without a single dissentient vote being recorded—and there are at least 24 representatives of the Government in the Assembly. They all concurred in this sentiment, which consists of two parts, first, that the Constitution should be revised before 1929; secondly, that the reason for that earlier revision is the progress made by India on the path of Responsible Government.

Now that 10 years' period and the idea of unfitness supposed to bar India's progress are both negatived by the Government of India themselves. •It is perfectly true that when this resolution was forwarded, with the sanction of the Government of India, to the Secretary of State here, he turned it down, but you have to consider that when the resolution was actually moved and supported by the Government of India, there was Non-Co-operation in full swing in India, the Coalition Government were in power here, and the Rt. Hon. Edwin S. Montagu presided in Whitehall over the India Office. When the Secretary of State subsequently turned down this resolution, things had changed. The Non-Co-operation movement declined rapidly in India, the situation became much easier, the Coalition Government here had gone out of power, and Lord Peel reigned in Whitehall. Then the official mind changed. But the official mind is apt to change, as you all know, according to circumstances. It adopts a statesman-like, liberal, wise policy at certain times, it adopts a policy the opposite of all this at certain other times. The authorities in India began to think that they were unwise to surrender power so easily or to promise to surrender power: "The time is not come, we can hold on a little while longer." That idea began to prevail in supersession of the larger and more liberal idea of an earlier date. It is not that the conditions of India had changed; it is not that the conditions had begun to be submitted to a very critical examina.

tion. It was merely that the official mind saw that the road was clear for another spell of autocratic power. Note this. As you know, it is commonly believed that India is held not only for high Imperial purposes, for connecting her in an honorable fashion with the Imperial Commonwealth, but that she is also held on less high grounds, to say the least of it. She affords careers for young men in England, careers of ease, of honorable comfort, where fame can be easily won. Then there are privileges and facilities for traders, for capitalists of sorts, and for those who seek concessions of one sort or another. Why, even Protestant missionaries, having obtained power in their Schools, are unwilling to limit that power by the enactment of a conscience clause. I begged them for several years to give a conscience clause to their pupils and to their parents, but the compulsory teaching of Christianity was such a temptation to them, so long as India was held in political subjection, that they would not voluntarily yield their ground. The idea was: Why yield this power that we have before the time comes? Now Education is transferred, local Legislature after local Legislature is enacting a conscience clause, and all the efforts of the Protestant missionaries now are directed towards seeing that the conscience clause does not take the strict Irish form but takes the more or less loose English form. Now, how graceful, how helpful, how conducive to harmony, would it have been if the missionaries sometime back

had themselves yielded the very limited conscience clause demanded by our people! But no, it is not human nature to give up power a day sooner than it is absolutely, unavoidably necessary.

And so now we have got to this position: that the authorities in India are not prepared to recommend Home Rule for India as a practical proposition to-day, but, unfortunately, the wish for Home Rule is such that when once it forms itself in the hearts of a Nation, nothing can prevent their marching towards it until it is actually obtained. Sometime ago I happened, in a public speech, to say that Dominion status did not operate in any shape or form in India, and a politician here corrected me by saying: "No, we have conferred Dominion status on India in so far as external affairs are concerned. Amongst the Nations of the world you are as good as South Africa, or Canada, appearing as such in the League of Nations, for example. Then we also treat you as a Dominion in the Imperial Conferences." I knew that was so in a modified sense, and I am about to bring to you a serious qualification about this statement. It is true that Dominion Status is accorded to India in these matters, but to the European part of India, and not to the Indian part of India. When we go to these Conferences and assemblages, it is not Indians that stand up for India, it is some European official or European merchant. Take the League of Nations, for example: I am omitting the reasons for the moment. It has held four sessions, and is about to hold

a fifth in Geneva, in September next: during those four sessions India has been represented by a delegation the leader and spokesman of which has always been a non-Indian. Now we, in India, feel that the time has come when India, as a member of the League of Nations, should be represented by her own people, and we therefore moved a resolution sometime ago asking the Governor-General to appoint an Indian to be the leader of the next Indian Delegation in Geneva. As I told you, our Government have a way of treating non-officials when they bring forward awkward resolutions. At the time conciliation was in the air, and the spokesmen of the Government spoke nicely to us in private and equally nicely in the meeting: they said, amongst other things, that the Indian Government felt it was an entirely natural wish, and when the time came for making nominations the authorities would remember the request made to them, and would the member kindly withdraw the resolution at that stage on that assurance being given? Now that assurance being given, the resolution was withdrawn. Not many months passed, however, before the Government appointed Lord Hardinge to be the leader of the Indian Delegation. Let me say I have nothing whatever to urge against Lord Hardinge, or any other non-Indian gentleman who has spoken for India on these occasions; they are probably more efficient spokesmen than any that India could have afforded; but it is a very natural ambition of India, after four years of membership

with the rest of the world, to consider that it is high time that some Indian gentleman should have been found for that post of honor. How long shall we appear amongst the Nations of the world as a people amongst whom the highest men still require to be in leading-strings, to be shepherded here and there by non-Indians? * * * * *

There is in session at this present moment a Conference of the Allied Powers, in London. To it have been called representatives of the Dominions: each Dominion is represented by its High Commissioner, a National India alone is represented at that Conference not by its High Commissioner, who is here, but by the Secretary of State for India. Now I have no doubt that, if this matter was argued, some technical point would be brought forward to justify the departure made in the case of India, but I know this, at the same time, that if the High Commissioner for India had been an Englishman, all the technical pleas would have been set aside and every facility would have been afforded him to represent India as the High Commissioner represents every other Dominions.

I am giving these two instances as they have arisen very recently, since we left India, to indicate to you the India Office attitude here and that of the authorities in India. They are anxious to make out a case for the postponement of Home Rule, and they are anxious to represent things as though in large matters and small, in Imperial matters as in home

affairs, there were no Indians competent to be trusted, but that they had always to find out some Englishman or other to represent India. That is the impression they want to produce on your innocent minds. That is the impression they want to produce on the Nations of the world before whom they have to justify their policy. When we come over to this country and speak to audiences we meet with a very great measure of sympathy. People say: "Why not, you seem to be asking for something reasonable, who is opposing it?" We are very much encouraged by the abundance of pro-Indian sentiment but how to mobilise it for our purpose? We cannot make India an election cry, and what is not an election cry and does not affect votes directly is only a sentiment, and no practical proposition; while those that have authority continually put all this public opinion aside and wish only to be guided by the public opinion of those in India, whose interests are bound up with the maintenance of India as a politically subordinate country. Now it would not be right for me to leave in your minds the impression that I am quarrelling with the Government of the day here. I have no quarrel with them. I realise their difficulties, and I know too that besides being kept out of actual power, by having no majority, they labor under certain disadvantages. One of them they inherit from the past: they have always been regarded as Little Englanders, out of sympathy with the Imperial sentiment of the race, and resolved when they came

into power to dismember the Empire; they have always been accused of being International and Cosmopolitan, rather than National and exclusive in their patriotism. They bring this ill-odor with them to their offices, and India being the Imperial part of this Commonwealth, they are naturally slow to touch India and liberate her, lest they should be accused of having surrendered what their ancestors acquired with great difficulty, and suffered India to depart where she should have been held in bondage. I can understand that reluctance: one member of the Cabinet nearly confessed it to me the other day; but I cannot sympathise with it. If I were a member of the Labor Government, I would say: "No matter what these critics of mine say, it is perfectly true that I detest the way in which commandment after commandment was broken and the Sermon on the Mount discredited while this Empire was being built up. I am not responsible for the methods by which the Empire was built up, but the Empire being there, it is my duty to preserve it, and I will preserve it as a Commonwealth and not merely as an Empire. I will preserve it by the adoption of methods and policies not breaking any of the great laws of God but by the adoption of methods and policies honorable to ourselves, respecting the freedom and liberties of other peoples, conformable to the highest and noblest traditions of our race, and at the same time helping forward the realisation of Humanity as one family." The Brotherhood of Nations, the Parliament of Man

the Federation of the World, these are the ideals of this Government, as of all cultured minds in this country, and in pursuing those ideals, if India is to be made to stand on her own feet, enjoying her liberty, an equal partner in the Commonwealth, it is right and proper, and entirely patriotic for the Labor Government to go forward. I hope they will not allow themselves to be deterred by any small considerations.
(Applause)

INDEX

PAGE.	PAGE.
A	B
<p>Address to the Liberal Federation... 378</p> <p>„ New Zealand Parliament... 269</p> <p>„ Students at Wellington... 279</p> <p>Administration of Kenya, The ... 464</p> <p>Africa or India— ... 541</p> <p>African Natives and Europeans ... 457</p> <p>Aga Khan and the Kenya Mission ... 556</p> <p>„ on Franchise Rights and Immigration Rights ... 556</p> <p>Ali Imam's Dinner, Speech at Sir ... 474</p> <p>Andrews on the 'Secret Compact' ... 574</p> <p>America and the Philippines ... 95</p> <p>Appeal for justice to Kenya Indians... 469</p> <p>„ to the Viceroy... 74</p> <p>Army, The ... 344</p> <p>Asiatic races and Self-Govt. 6</p> <p>Assembly and Council of the League ... 197</p> <p>Asquith on Irish discontent 94</p> <p>Atkinson, Sir John on Krishnaswami Iyer ... 37</p> <p>Australia, Indians in Western ... 259</p> <p>„ Instability of cabinets in ... 26</p> <p>Australian States, The... 26</p>	<p>Bajpai, Mr. ... 244</p> <p>Bangalore, Speech at ... 517</p> <p>Blood ties not essential. 63</p> <p>Boer Empire ... 553</p> <p>Bombay Liberal Conference Address ... 207</p> <p>„ & Madras Local Self-Government in ... 114</p> <p>„ Provincial Conference Address ... 75</p> <p>Bonar Law on Irish discontent ... 94</p> <p>Boycott of the Prince ... 229</p> <p>Brahmins & Non-Brahmins 42</p> <p>Britain and India ... 468</p> <p>Britannic Commonwealth 249</p> <p>British Cabinet and Kenya decision ... 562</p> <p>British citizenship ... 317</p> <p>„ Constitution, Scope of the ... 171</p> <p>„ Democracy and India ... 70</p> <p>„ Empire League of Nations union ... 423</p> <p>„ „ meeting ground of races ... 271</p> <p>„ „ moral bank-ruptcy of 467</p> <p>„ Rule in India—By Joseph Chailley 62</p> <p>Briton, The hardened ... 525</p> <p>Bruce, Sir Charles, on Treatment of Dependent Peoples ... 49</p>

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Bryce on Free institutions ...	66	Congress and Scheme ...	88
" voters ...	46	" Speech, Delhi...	141
Budget Speech in 1917 ...	71	Corbett of the Civil Service, Mr. ...	244
C		Conscience clause and the new Legislatures.	592
Callous disregard of liberty ...	156	Constitution, revision of the ...	590
Campbell-Bannerman and the Boers ...	28	Constitutional advance, Three ways of ...	221
Canada in 1792 ...	59	Convention from the Legislatures ...	226
" fifty years ago ...	21	Cotton Imports, duty on.	103
" The French and English in, ...	25	Cotton's <i>New India</i> , Sir Henry ...	5
Canadian Club, Speech at the ...	315	Council, and the Assembly of the League. 197,	408
Castes and creeds ...	41	Criminal Law Amendment Bill ...	146
Catholics, disabilities of.	51	Critics of the League ...	193
Central Government The ...	232, 281	Curtis, L. on the Problem of Commonwealth 29, 51	
Chatterjee (A. C.) and the Geneva Assembly.	595	" Imperial Parliament scheme of ...	82
Chitrol (Sir Valentine) on Sir S. P. Sinha ...	36	Chailley (Joseph) on British rule in India...	62
C. I. D., The ...	135	D	
Citizen rights of Indians in the Empire ...	466	Defence Force ...	130
Citizenship, Rights of ...	261	Degradation, a place of	265
Civilization of India ...	7	Delegation to Colonial Office ...	561
Champion of Kenya Whites ...	529	Delhi Conference, memorandum to ...	421
Colonial Autonomy ...	87	" Congress speech ...	141
" Office, complaint against ...	494	Deputation to the Imperial Parliament...	226
" <i>Swaraj</i> ...	3	Despatch of August 1911	1
Colonies and Japan ...	20	De Wet, the rebellion of.	28
" Committee, Resolution on the ...	568	Diarchy ...	353
Compact of 1918 ...	321	" the principle of...	228
Compulsory education ...	131	" overstraining ...	231
Commonwealth or Empire ...	598	Disabilities of Indians in the Dominions ...	376
Congress and Post-War Reforms ...	75	Disarmament and the League ...	199
" Presidential Address of Lord Sinha ...	8		

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Gokhale as leader of the opposition ...	445	Hughes' letter to Mr. Sastri ...	318
" What he would have done ? ...	438	I	
Gokhale's moderation ...	449	Ideas of human fellow-ship ...	257
Gospel of Swaraj ...	211	If we were a Dominion ...	559
Government and Municipalities ...	119	Imam, Sir Ali ...	36
" Backed by public opinion ...	571	Immigration Bill ...	520
" Distrust of ...	218	" into India Bill ...	532
" of India Act, Ten Year clause in the ...	227	" restrictions ...	581
" India's difficulties ...	289	Imperial Conference, India and the ...	77
" Loss of faith in ...	254	" Conference Resolution of ...	291
" raising a storm ...	148	" Conference of Premiers ...	257
Government's Security ...	244	" Federation ...	81
Great Britain's Pledge to India ...	326	" Preference ...	105
Great men of Bengal ...	205	" War Conference ...	75
Great Political Lesson—Guildhall Speech, the—	188	I.M.S., order regarding ...	339
Gupta, Sir K. G. ...	35	India, a Dominion ...	586
H		" an equal partner in the Empire ...	288
Haldane's evidence on the Riot Act ...	178	" and the British democracy ...	70
Hammick, Sir Murray on Krishnaaswami Iyer ...	37	" Conference of Allied Powers ...	596
Hardinge (Lord) on Passive Resistance ...	559	" " Dominions ...	246
" on Sir Ali Imam ...	36	" " Imperial Commonwealth ...	77
" Advice to the Civil Service ...	17	" and the Labour Government ...	599
Hertzogism, outbreak of ...	28	" and the League of Nations ...	593
Highlands of Kenya ...	584	" Office, relations with ...	495
Hinduism, essence of ...	312	" within the Empire or without ? ...	300
Hindu and the Muslim ...	212	Indian Constitution, evolution of ...	52
Hindus and Mahomedans ...	41	" Councils, evolution of ...	53
Home Rule or Colonial Autonomy ...	87	Indians, a word to ...	297
" by stages ...	589	" Abroad ...	275

INDEX

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Indians, and Englishmen	237	Kenya Congress	... 558
" " Military Service	...	" Deputation's statement	... 491
" Citizen rights of	466	" Four main heads of dispute	... 491
" Overseas	347	" Future lines of activity	... 500
" Overseas and Indian States...	530	" Indians in	... 451
" in Australia	377	" Indians, view of	557
" " British Columbia	315	" lost, everything lost	... 517
" " Canada	392	" Mission and the Aga Khan	... 556
" " The Empire...	263	" Question	... 567
" " Executive offices	34	" White settlers of rebellion in	554
" " Kenya	451	" Whites, Champion of	... 529
" " New Zealand	387	Khadhar	... 309
" " S. Africa	515	Krishnaswami Aiyer of Madras	34, 37
" " Western Australia	259		
Indianisation of the Services	... 412	L	
India's Goal	... 1	Labour Conference, Washington	... 200
" position in the League	... 412	" Party	... 331
" slow march to freedom	... 97	" and India	... 593
" thought	... 272	Lancashire, Champions of	... 106
Innocents are not safe	... 153	League and Disarmament, Balfour's view	... 199
Irish discontent, a parallel	94	" " its Secretariat	... 201
J		" " The Opium Question.	415
Japan and the Colonies	20	" , War	... 195
" Charter Oath of 1861,	52	" Committees of the	... 411
Judicial proceedings, Sir James Stephen on	182	" Council and Assembly	... 408
K		" Critics of the	... 193
Kenya, a succession of pledges	... 496	" India's contribution to the	201
" Administration of	464	" India's position in the	... 412
" and Anglo-Indians	523		
" and British Cabinet	... 562		
" as a Crown Colony	487		
" betrayal, The	501		
" " and the Servants of India Society	509		

INDEX

vii

PAGE.	PAGE.
Non-Co-operation, a doctrine of Negation. 213	R
" Movement. 210	Race, the argument of... 45
O	<i>Race Prejudice</i> by Jean Finot ... 47
Objections answered ... 54	Rankling Sense of Injustice ... 277
O'Dwyer, Sir Michael, a quotation for ... 91	Ratepayers and local Self-Government ... 115
Our constitutional battle. 529	Rationale of Autonomy. 48
Our demand ... 84	Real Liberty ... 273
"Our duty" ... 66	Rebellion of people, no... 302
P	Reciprocity measure in The Council of State ... 549
Paranjpye, Mr. ... 219	Reconciliation of East & West ... 250
Parliamentary Commission of 1835 ... 29	Record of Failure, A ... 573
Parties, formation of ... 367	Redmond's appeal, Mr. 92
Past history, a page from ... 528	Refinement of Distrust... 284
Peel's message to Sastri, Lord ... 240	Reforms of 1909 ... 441
" Council ... 555	" demanded ... 364
Period of Transition ... 253	" The working of 350
Personal critics— ... 248	Repeal of Repressive Laws ... 165
Perth, Speech at— ... 251	Repealing the Press Act 169
Philippines & America ... 95	Reply to Civic Welcome at Suva ... 285
" Fitness for self-rule ... 51	" General Smuts... 510
Policy of vigorous action. 501	Repressive laws—three classes ... 168
Political agitation, the art of ... 66	" infringing popular liberty ... 166
Post-War reforms and the Congress ... 75	Report on the Dominions Tour ... 374
Press Act, repealing the. 169	" of Lord Durham. 20
Problem of the Commonwealth... 29	Reserved and Transferred Departments ... 229
" By L. Curtis 51	Resolution of Imperial Conference ... 291
Problems of Empire ... 319	" on Kenya ... 451
Prosperous yet discontented ... 93	" on the Colonies Committee ... 568
Provincial autonomy ... 225	Responsible Government for India, the aim of British statesmanship. 327
Public Services question. 121	Responsibility and Fitness ... 51
Queen's Hall, Speech at the ... 470	

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Retaliatory or punitive efforts ...	503	Self-Government & Asiatic races...	6
Revision of the Constitution ...	590	" for Dominions ...	327
Revolution and India ...	267	" for India ...	20
Right to speak and the right to rule ...	93	" Three possible ways of ...	12
Rights, equality of ...	579	Self-rule, fitness for ...	15
" or citizenship ...	261	Sense of grievance ...	274
Riot Act, English— ...	176	Servants of India Society and the Kenya betrayal ...	509
" Haldane's evidence on the ...	178	Services, Indianisation of the ...	339
Ripon's Resolution of 1882, Lord ...	19	" Control of the... ...	341
Roberts (Charles) on Sir K. G. Gupta ...	35	" for India ...	324
Robertson, John M. on The Rationale of Autonomy ...	48	Setalvad, Sir C— ...	207
Roll up our Courts ...	150	Sethna, The Hon. Mr. Pheroze ...	207
Royal Colonial Institute, Speech at the ...	318	Short cuts ...	157
Rowlatt Act ...	217	Signs of reaction ...	330
" Bill ...	146	Simla Banquet, Speech at the ...	240
" Committee—recommendations of the ...	147	Smuts (Gen.) on Mr. Sastri's mission ...	548
S		Sinha (Now Lord) ...	35, 36
Salaries, threatened increase in ...	337	Sinha's Congress Address ...	8
Sapru (Dr.) and the Colonies Committee ...	570	Smuts' (Gen.) reply ...	510
Sapru's (Dr.) services ...	516	" Memorandum ...	545
Sastri or Gandhi—Gokhale's successor ...	446	South Africa, Gokhale and ...	34
" Why he did not go to South Africa ...	512	" responsible Government in... ...	28
Satyagrahasrama ...	307	South African Union ...	28
'Secret Compact,' A ...	574	Speech at Bangalore ...	517
Secretariat of the League ...	201	" the Canadian Club ...	315
Sedition Committee's Report ...	135	" Hotel Cecil ...	474
Select Committee of Parliament ...	228	" The League of Nations ...	192
Separate electorates in Kenya ...	577	" Montreal Reform Club ...	300
		" Perth ...	256
		" The Royal Colonial Institute ...	318
		" Simla Banquet ...	240
		Status of British Indians ...	283
		Step by step theory, The ...	96

HINDUISM

By BABU GOVINDA DAS.

IN this remarkable treatise Babu Govinda Das, the well-known writer and Sanskrit scholar depicts the character and genius of Hinduism through the centuries. He traces the origin and development of the religion of the Aryas since the Vedic times and shows how new rites and practices, some wholesome and some unwholesome have crept into the fabric of the Hindu faith. He brings the light of rational criticism to the interpretation of the Hindu religion. The book deals with the sources of Hinduism, its fundamental teachings, its rites and customs, and is invaluable to students of comparative religion, social reformers and legislators. Writing of the purpose of the book the author says in the Introduction:—The idea underlying the composition of the book has been that of the great principle that whatever makes for unification, for sympathy, for expansion, for enlightenment, for toleration, for freedom is to be encouraged; and all that makes against these, that is in fact separative, destructive, narrowing, productive of hatred and strife, curtails liberty, encourages superstition and credulity is to be discouraged.

Cloth bound 450 pages.

Rs. 3. To Subs. of the "Indian Review." Rs. 2-8.

G. A. Natesan & Co., Publishers, George Town, Madras.


BIOGRAPHIES OF EMINENT INDIANS.

 Series of uniform Booklets each with a Portrait and a biographical sketch with copious extracts.

Dadabhai Naoroji	Raja Ram Mohan Roy
Sir P. M. Mehta	Devendranath Tagore
G. K. Gokhale	Dinshaw Edulji Wacha
Lala Lajpat Rai	Mahadev Govind Ranade
Ravi Varma	Sir Rash Behari Ghose
K. T. Telang	Sir Surendranath Banerjee
Ananda Mohan Bose	Sir T. Muthusami Iyer
W. C. Bonnerjee	H. H. the Aga Khan
Lal Mohun Ghose	Sir S. Subramania Iyer
Sir J. C. Bose	Bal Gangadhar Tilak
Dr. P. C. Ray	Madan Mohan Malaviya
Lord Sinha	Bahu Kristo Das Pal
Prof. D. K. Karve	V. Krishnaswami Aiyar
Budruddin Tyahji	Rahimtulla Mohamed Sayani
Sir Syed Ahmed	Iswara Chandra Vidyasagar
Sir Syed Amir Ali	Behramji M. Malahari
M. K. Gandhi	Sir C. Sankaran Nair
R. N. Mudholkar	H. H. the Gaekwar of Baroda
J. N. Tata.	Sir N. G. Chandavarkar
Sasipada Banerji	Pratapchandra Mazumdar
V. K. Chiplankar	Sir V. Bhashyam Iyengar.
Kesavchandra Sen	Dr. Asutosh Mukherjee.
Syed Hasan Imam	C. R. Das.
Aurobindo Ghose.	Motilal Nehru.
Hakim Ajmal Khan	The Ali Brothers.
	Rt. Hon. V. S. Sreenivasa Sastri.

Foolscap 8vo. Price **Annas Four** each.

INDIAN POETS.

 EACH sketch contains a brief account of the life and career of the poet described and copious extracts from their writings and also a frontispiece.

Ghalib	Toru Dutt
Romesh Chander Dutt.	Michael Madhusudan Dutt.
Rabindranath Tagore.	Mrs. Sarojini Naidu.
Bankim C. Chatterjee.	B. M. Malabari

Price 4 **As.** each.

G. A. Natesan & Co., Publishers, George Town, Madras.

Indian Statesmen.

THIS is a new series of uniform booklets containing sketches of the lives of eminent Indian Statesmen, notably those who have been Dewans and Prime Ministers of well-known States. With frontispiece and extracts from Speeches & Writings.

V. P. Madhava Rao	Sir M. Visvesvaraya
Nawab Mohsin-ul-Mulk.	Sir Seshiah Sastri
Sir Salar Jung	Raja Sir T. Madhava Rao
Dewan C. Rangacharlu	Sir Dinkar Rao
R. Raghunatha Rau	R. C. Dutt
Sir Seshadri Aiyar	

Price Annas Four each.

"Saints of India" Series

THESE lives are all based on the original accounts and biographies in the several Indian languages. Each book also contains a special account of the peculiar religious doctrines which each saint taught.

Dayaneshwar	Nammalwar	Vallabhacharya
Namdev	Appar	Nanak
Ekanath	Nanda	Guru Govind
Ramdas	Kabir	Dayananda
Tukaram	Chaitanya	Ramakrishna
Tulsidas	Vivekananda	Ram Tirath

Price Four Annas each.

"Friends of India" Series

THESE biographies are so written as to form a gallery of portraits of permanent interest to the student, as well as to the politician. With copious extracts from Speeches & Writings and a frontispiece

Lord Ripon	Rev. Dr. Miller	Lord Macaulay
Annie Besant	Henry Fawcett	John Bright
Lord Minto	A. O. Hume	Nivedita
Bradlaugh	Sir Henry Cotton	

Foolscap 8vo. Price Annas Four each.

G.A. Natesan & Co., Publishers, George Town, Madras.

INDIAN ARTS, INDUSTRIES & AGRICULTURE

Indian Industrial and Economic Problems. By Hon. Prof. V. G. Kale, Rs. 2. To Subs. of "I. R." Re. 1-8.

Essays on Indian Economics. (3rd Edition.) By Mahadev Govind Ranade. Rs. 2. To Subs. of "I. R." Re. 1-8.

Industrial India. By Glyn Barlow, M.A. Second Edition. Re. 1. To Subscribers of the "I. R." As. 12.

The Swadeshi Movement.—A Symposium. Second Edition. Re. 1-4. To Subs. of the "I. R." Re. 1.

Agricultural Industries in India. By Seedick R. Sayani. Second Edition. Revised and enlarged. Re. 1. To Subscribers of the "Indian Review" As. 12.

Lift-Irrigation. By A. Chatterton. Second Edition. Rs. 2. To Subscribers of "I. R." Re. 1-8.

The Improvement of Indian Agriculture.—Some Lessons from America. By Cathelyne Singh. Second Edition. Price Re. 1. To Subscribers of "I. R." As. 12.

184 INDIAN TALES

OF

FUN, FOLLY AND FOLK-LORE

A COLLECTION OF THE

TALES OF TENNALI RAMAN

TALES OF MARIADA RAMAN

TALES OF RAJA BIRBAL

KOMATI WIT AND WISDOM

THE SON-IN-LAW ABROAD

NEW INDIAN TALES

TALES OF RAYA AND APPAJI

FOLKLORE OF THE TELUGUS

☛ Eight booklets in one volume. ☛

Price Re. 1-4 as.

To Subscribers of the *Indian Review*, Re. 1.

G. A. Natesan & Co., Publishers, George Town, Madras.

15 UNIFORM CLOTH-BOUND VOLUMES

SPEECHES AND WRITINGS OF

SIR J. C. BOSE.

His Life, Discoveries and Writings.

Dr. RAY'S ESSAYS AND DISCOURSES.

ANNIE BESANT. A comprehensive collection.

THE RT. HON. LORD SINHA.

First collection.

SWAMI VIVEKANANDA. 6th Edition.

DADABHAI NAOROJI. 2nd Edition.

SIR WILLIAM WEDDERBURN.

MADAN MOHAN MALAVIYA.

MOHANDAS K. GANDHI.

Third Edition, revised, enlarged and up-to-date.

SURENDRANATH BANERJEA.

SIR DINSHA WACHA.

Price of each Vol. Rs. 3.

To Subscribers of the "Indian Review," Rs. 2-8 *as*.

GOPAL KRISHNA GOKHALE.

3rd Edition. Price Rs. 4. To Subs. of "I. R." Rs. 3-8.

UNIFORM WITH THE ABOVE.

Indian National Evolution. A Survey of the origin and progress of the Indian National Congress and the Growth of Indian Nationalism. By Amvica Charan Mazumdar. Second Edition. Price Rs. 3. To Subscribers of the "Indian Review", Rs. 2-8.

The Governance of India. A hand-book of progressive politics by Babu Govinda Das. Price Rs. 3. To Subscribers of the "Indian Review" Rs. 2-8.

The Mission of Our Master. Essays & Discourses by the Eastern and Western Disciples of Ramakrishna-Vivekananda. Rs. 3. To Subs. of "I.R." Rs. 2-8.

G. A. Natesan & Co., Publishers, George Town, Madras.

HINDU RELIGION AND PHILOSOPHY

The Bhagavad-Gita. With the Text in Devanagari and an English Translation by Annie Besant. Fourth Edition. Price per copy Annas Four.

The Three Great Acharyas : Sankara, Ramanuja and Madhwa : A study of their Lives and Times and a critical exposition of their philosophy. In one volume. Rs. Two. To Subscribers of "I. R." Rs. 1-8.

Light on Life. A Selection of Six Spiritual Discourses by Baba Premanand Bharati. Price Re. One. To Subscribers of the "Indian Review," 12 as.

The Life and Teachings of Buddha. By A. Dharmapala. Price As. 12. 2nd Edn. To Subscribers of "I. R." As. 8.

Sri Sankaracharya's Select Works. The Text in Sanskrit, Devanagiri type and an English Translation. By S. Venkataramanan, B.A. 2nd Edn. Rs. 2. To Subs. I.R. Rs. 1-8.

The Vaishnavite Reformers of India.—Critical Sketches of their Lives and Writings. By T. Rajagopalachariar, M.A., B.L. Price Re. 1. To Subscribers of "I.R." As. 12.

Swami Vivekananda : Speeches and Writings. With four Portraits. 5th Edn. Rs. 3. To Subs. of "I.R." Rs. 2-8.

The Mission of Our Master. Essays and Discourses by the Eastern and Western Disciples of Ramakrishna-Vivekananda. Rs. 3. To Subs. of "I.R." Rs. 2-8.

Aspects of the Vedanta. By various writers. Third Edition. Re. 1. To Subscribers of the "I. R." As. 12.

Ten Tamil Saints. By M. S. Purnalingam Pillai, B.A., L.T. Price As. 12. To Subscribers of "I.R." As. 8.

Essentials of Hinduism. As. 12. To Subs. of "I.R." As. 10.

Hindu Psalms & Hymns. By K. V. Ramaswami. As. 4.

Maitreyi : A Vedic Story. By Pandit Sitanath Tattvabhushan. Price As. 4.

Vemana. The Telugu Poet and Saint. By C. Ramakrishna Rau. As. 4.

Aggressive Hinduism. By Sister Nivedita. As. Two.

Nation-Building : A Stirring appeal to Indians by Annie Besant. As. 2.

G. A. Natesan & Co., Publishers, George Town, Madras.

BOOKS ON INDIA.

Visvabharati. By Dr. Rabindranath and Mr. C. F. Andrews, with 8 Portraits and illustrations. Price 8 As. To Subscribers of the "I. R." 6 as.

Eminent Orientalists. Indian, English, German, French and American. Cloth bound Rs 2. To Subscribers of the "Indian Review," Re. 1-8 as.

Prince Edward's Speeches in India. A collection of H. R. H. the Prince of Wales' Speeches in India with numerous portraits and illustrations. Re. One. To Subscribers of the "Indian Review," 12 as.

Delhi. The Capital of India. Revised and enlarged edition of "All About Delhi." With 54 illustrations. Price Rs. 2. To Subscribers of *I. R.*, Re. 1-8.

"The Indian Problem" By C. F. Andrews. The book of the hour, containing chapters on Indian Independence; India and the Empire; Non-Co-operation; Swadeshi National Education; The Drink and Opium Evil and Untouchability. In one volume, with a frontispiece, Second Edition, Price Re. One. To Subscribers of the "Indian Review," as. 12.

The Mission of Our Master. Essays and Discourses. By the Eastern and Western Disciples of Ramakrishna—Vivekananda. Price Rs. 3. To Subscribers of the "Indian Review" Rs. 2-8.

Bureaucratic Government. A Study in Indian Polity. By Mr. Bernard Houghton, I.C.S. (Retd.) Price Re. 1-8 To Subscribers of the "I. R." Re. 1-4.

Morley's Indian Speeches Re. 1-8. To Subscribers of the "I.R." Re. 1-4.

Montagu's Indian Speeches. Price Re. 1-8. To Subscribers of the "I.R." Re. 1-4

Sarojini Naidu's Speeches and Writings With a biographical sketch. Second Edition. Revised and Enlarged. Re 1-4. To Subscribers of "I.R." Re. 1.

Rash Behari Ghose's Speeches and Writings. Second Edition. Price Re. 1-4. To Subscribers of the "*Indian Review*," Re. 1.

Nation-Building A Stirring appeal to Indians by Annie Besant. As. 2

G.A. Natesan & Co, Publishers, George Town, Madras.

GANDHI: HIS LIFE & SPEECHES

Gandhi's Speeches and Writings. Including Contributions to *Young India* & *Navajivan*. Third Edition, up-to-date and enlarged. Contains his speeches and writings on the South African Indian Question his



views on independent Labour and Indians in the Colonies his jail experiences in South Africa his pronouncements on the Champaran & Khaira affairs, Rowlatt Bills and Satyagraha, the Punjab out-

rages, the Khilafat Question, Swaraj, and other articles reprinted from *Young India* and *Navajivan*. Contains also an account of his arrest and trial and messages from the gaol. With numerous appreciations, portraits and illustrations, cloth bound, indexed. Rs. 3. To Subscribers of the "Indian Review," Rs. 2-8.

Hind Swaraj or Indian Home Rule. By Gandhi. Cheap popular Edition. As. 8. To Subs. "I. R." As. 6.

M. K. Gandhi. By the Rev. Joseph Doke. With a Foreword by Lord Ampthill. A cheap, popular edition. Re. One. To Subscribers of the *Indian Review*. As. 12.

Bureaucratic Government. A Study in Indian Polity. By Mr. Bernard Houghton. Popular Indian Edition. Price Re. 1-8 To Subscribers of the "I. R." Re. 1-4.

G. A. Natesan & Co., Publishers, George Town, Madras.

Eminent Orientalists.

INDIAN, ENGLISH, FRENCH, GERMAN AND AMERICAN

This is the first attempt to present under one cover a succinct account of the lives and achievements of well-known Orientalists, who have done pioneer work in the field of Indology. The activities of this group of savants—English, Scotch, French, German, American, and Indian, have been many-sided. They have explored the regions of archæology, epigraphy and palaeography, and have thus opened out vistas of knowledge in directions never before thought of.

Among the Orientalists Studied are : Sir William Jones, Sir Charles Wilkins, Colebrook, Horace Wilson, George Tournour, Fergusson, Rajendral Mitra, Telang, Bhau Daji and Indraj, Dr. Buhler, Monier Williams, Max Muller, Sir John Fleet, Edwin Arnold, Nivedita, Griffith, Whitney, Vincent Smith, Tilak, Anundoran Borooah, Bhandarkar, Macdonne, Keith, Paul Deussen and Sylvain Levi.

Among the contributors to the volume are: Prof. P. Seeshadri, Prof. Radhakrishnan, Dr. S Krishnaswami Ayengar, Prof. P. P. S. Sastri, Mr. Shambu Chunder Dey, Prof. Suryanarayana, Mr. Vasant Naik, Mr. K. S. Ramaswami Sastri, Prof. M. S. Ramaswami Ayengar, Prof. Surya Kumar Bhuyan, Prof. Srinivasa-chari, and Mr. D. W. Wickramarachi.

The Times of India;—The biographies go right down to the present day and give a good deal of information which is not easily available.

—Swaraja;—We heartily recommend this book to any one who desires to have within the compass of a few pages a true and faithful study of Indian Culture.

Sani Vartaman;—Recently the West has done something for the East but this is simply in part payment of the huge debt she contracted centuries ago. Natesan's books show how this debt has been liquidated. The Leader;—Interesting and stimulating.

Price Rs. 2 (Two)

To Subscribers of the "Indian Review," Re. 1-8.

G. A. Natesan & Co., Publishers, George Town, Madras.

